

OCT 18 1926

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. A. G. CLARK, Litt.D., F.R.S., *Hon. Treasurer.*

L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. B. S. CONWAY,  
Litt.D., F.R.S.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

J. BELL, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society.

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XL

SEPTEMBER, 1926

No. 4

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS .. .. .	113	REVIEWS (continued):	
IEPI AABANTON. II. J. C. LAWSON ..	116	<i>Cicero, de Finibus</i> (Reid). A. C. CLARK ..	130
ON TACITUS, <i>Historiae</i> II. 20. J. P. POSTGATE	122	<i>Ciceronis Epistulae ad Familiares</i> (Sjögren). L. C. PURSER .. .. .	133
REVIEWS:		<i>The Commentaries of Caesar on the Civil War</i> (Moberley and Last). A. G. PESKETT	134
<i>Greek Ethical Thought from Homer to the</i> <i>Stoics</i> (Oakeley). R. B. OMANS ..	122	<i>Les Bucoliques</i> (Goelzer). J. S. PHILLIMORE	135
<i>Thirteen Epistles of Plato</i> (Post). R. HACK- FORTH .. .. .	123	<i>Pastoral and Allegory</i> (Phillimore). J. W. MACKAIL .. .. .	136
<i>Plotinus, the fourth Ennead</i> (MacKenna). S. C. NEILL .. .. .	124	<i>Roman Buildings of the Republic</i> (Frank). D. S. ROBERTSON .. .. .	137
<i>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum</i> . W. M. CALDER .. .. .	126	SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	137-139
<i>The Wandering Scholar</i> (Hogarth). W. M. CALDER .. .. .	127	CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY ..	139
<i>Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Liter- atur</i> (Kroll). E. A. SONNENSCHN ..	128	OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY ..	140
<i>Pseudo-Plautus: Le prix des âmes</i> (Havet- Freté). J. S. PHILLIMORE .. ..	129	SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. ..	140
		BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	142

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.  
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3.  
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW  
25s. net, post free U.S.A. \$6 25

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. M. T. Smiley, University College, London; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Mr. C. T. Seltman, Queens' College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. S. K. Johnson, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. R. W. Jackson, 16, Freemantle Square, Cotham, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. L. Topham, Firth Park Secondary School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss B. A. Leary, County School for Girls, Ashford; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton, Mr. T. A. Sinclair, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; and Mr. C. W. Baty, 40, Waterloo Road, Bedford.

## FISHING FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES

By William Radcliffe

Sometime of Balliol College, Oxford

21s. net.

Dr. J. W. Mackail in *The Journal of Roman Studies*: 'This wholly delightful book should have a place in every scholar's library. It contains an immense mass of information never before set forth. Every page is interesting. We seem to listen throughout to the best kind of talk, full of lively wit and bubbling humour and yet keeping a large and full course.'

REVISED EDITION  
WITH ADDITIONAL ILLUSTRATIONS  
AND A NEW BIBLIOGRAPHY

## CLASSICAL STUDIES

By J. W. Mackail, M.A., LL.D.

Honorary Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford

7s. 6d. net.

CONTENTS: The Place of Greek and Latin in Human Life—The Report of the Prime Minister's Committee on the Classics in Education—What is the Good of Greek? Penelope in the Odyssey—The Alliance of Latin and English Studies—Virgil's Italy—The Virgilian Underworld—The Odes of Horace—The Last Great Roman Historian—The Classics—The Place of the Classics in Imperial Studies—Patriotism.

*The Times*: 'Dr. Mackail is not only a literary critic of the first order, but he is also a scholar in touch with the modern world and its educational requirements; this double qualification gives him such a right to speak and to be heard as few men may claim.'

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1



T  
n  
C  
  
s  
h  
E  
t  
n  
k  
A  
v  
i  
c  
t  
E  
t  
c  
t  
s  
a  
n  
s  
t  
f  
n  
a  
s  
c  
s



# The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1926

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE following is an abridgement of a notice kindly written by Professor R. S. Conway:

'Among the many British classical scholars of the last fifty years it will hardly be disputed that Sir William Ridgeway was the greatest, and perhaps the only one whom posterity will recognise as a great master and maker of knowledge like Darwin and Mommsen. About 1895 Henry Jackson said to me with deliberate earnestness: "Ridgeway is always right. He gets to the bottom of things. Of whom else can you say that?" His fearless enquiries emancipated classical study from a blind devotion to a few eminent Germans. His discoveries were fiercely resisted, but they passed current so soon that younger scholars, including some of his reviewers, assumed their truth and gave the author no thanks. That Homer's horses were small enough to pull a wheelbarrow; that his fair Achaeans and Sáfines came from mid-Europe, with the iron sword, round shield and greaves of Hallstatt, and sterner, northern morals; that the tunny, the silphium, the ox on early coins were not objects of worship but sound tokens of commerce; that the odes of drama were not adulterated dithyrambs to Dionysus but praises of the heroes, first danced out round their tombs: such things we now know, but it needed Ridgeway's genius to discover them. Those of us whom it concerns that the great ancient writers be not represented as prone to run into nonsense, nor defended by venerable and incredible glosses, but understood as honestly dealing with the life that they knew, will always think of Ridgeway as a great interpreter and historian of the spirit of man.

'His work is incomplete, though much of Vol. II. of *The Early Age of Greece* has long been in type; and no one knew better than he how much even Vol. I. stood to gain by an Index and Corri-

genda, and by the review of some of its topics from a different standpoint. The chapters on Religion are an urgent need. Yet in the true sense the discoverer's work is always incomplete; and in spite of weaker eyesight and a terrible bereavement Ridgeway continued to the end his heroic quest of truth.

'Of the guidance and warm-hearted help which he gave, all through his life, to younger men; of his controversies, academic and political, worthy of his Devonian and Cromwellian ancestors, "all first-class fighting men"; of his inexhaustible Irish humour; of his eloquence, flashing in quick phrases, and leaping like a falcon tugging at the chain; of the hospitality which he and Lady Ridgeway loved to show at Fen Ditton; of his cordial acquaintance with all sorts and conditions of men, from jockeys to bishops: of such things I would gladly write if space were given; but nothing written could represent our loss to those who did not know him—a great adversary, a great friend, a great heart.'

---

From a correspondent:

'The name of Dr. J. P. Postgate deserves more than ordinary commemoration in this *Review*. When it was founded in 1887 he took an active part in its promotion. He was its Editor from 1898 until 1906, when the *Classical Quarterly* was started. He then elected to take up the chief Editorship of the *C.Q.*, which he held until 1910. How exacting both offices are, what patience, judgment, and tact their due performance requires, is hardly known to any who have not had personal experience of them.

'Throughout that period, as also before and after it, he was a frequent and valued contributor to the *C.R.* His first article was an appeal for the reformed pronunciation of Latin, which he lived to see accepted; his last ap-

peared only a few months ago. Not only, however, among readers of the Classical journals, but wherever the faith and love of the Classics exist, he must be remembered as one of the chief originators of the Classical Association, and, indeed, its founder, so far as that name can be given to any single scholar, though Professor Sonnenschein, who is still with us, shared with him the first active steps in its formation. When Postgate resigned secretaryship of the C.A. in 1906, he was spoken of as "the father of the Association," and one "who had done more work for it than any other member."

'Space does not permit here of giving any list, still less any weighed appreciation, of Postgate's published contributions to scholarship, including the new *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, produced under his editorship, and his texts, with critical commentaries, of Phaedrus and Propertius. But one may be mentioned as not generally accessible: the masterly and stimulating essay, *Flaws in Classical Research*, printed in the Proceedings of the British Academy for 1908. It deserves republication.

'On retiring from the Chair of Latin at Liverpool in 1920, he returned to live in Cambridge, and had leisure to produce much of his most valuable work, the distilled product of a lifetime of accurate study: his *Translation and Translations, Theory and Practice* (1922), his *Prosodia Latina* (1923), his *Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek "in usum doctorum"* (1924), and his Presidential Address to the Classical Association in 1925, *Classics To-day*—admirable both as a sketch of the actual position and as a summary of the work calling to be done, which is, in one word, the application of intelligence to scholarship.

'The accident by which he met his death last July happened to a man of seventy-three, who persisted in retaining the energy and endeavouring to retain the activity of youth. His mind had not grown old. For many colleagues or pupils the memory of him which remains is not only of a fine scholar but of a good friend and a very lovable man.'

*The Manchester Guardian* of June 19th contained the preliminary announcement of a discovery of some interest to readers of the *Classical Review*. For it was the *Classical Review* which in 1910 (p. 76) published an inscription, whose discovery had previously been announced in *The Times*, proving a close association of the gods Zeus and Hermes in the cult of the Trogitis region, which lay some twenty-five miles south-west of Lystra; and pointed out the bearing of this discovery on the story narrated in *Acts of the Apostles*, ch. 14. In May of the present year an expedition (Professor Calder, Mr. Buckler, and Mr. Pares) working under the auspices of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor found a monument which bears still more intimately on the identification of Paul and Barnabas with Hermes and Zeus by the Lycaonian *ἑχλοῖ* of Lystra. This was an altar (unfortunately mutilated) belonging to Lystra itself, dedicated 'to the Epēkoos and to . . . and to Hermes.' Whether we restore *Δι* in the second place, or treat the Epēkoos ('the god who hearkens to prayer') as an hypostasis of the supreme god in the local cult of Lystra, this inscription proves for Lystra itself the association of Hermes with Zeus which, according to *Acts*, found expression when the two Apostles visited the town.

From Professor R. S. Conway:

'Readers of the *Review* who are not also readers of *Discovery* may like to know that the July number of that periodical contains an excellent photograph (kindly sent me by Professor Paribeni, Curator of the Museo delle Terme) of the newly discovered—or, more strictly, newly identified—fragment of the Consular Fasti, with a preliminary and non-technical account of its outstanding features. Except for marginal breaks it exactly fills the gap in Tabula III. (see *C.I.L.* I., ed. 2 *ad fin.*), which is now almost completely in our hands. The block gives the official list of consuls and censors between 278 and 269 B.C. in its left-hand column, and those between 214 and 207 in its right-hand column;

the last complete line, however, contains the names of the consuls for 208, Marcellus and Crispinus. To the name of Crispinus a later hand has added *ex uol* [*m. e.*—i.e., *ex uolneribus mortuus est*; but since Marcellus was (according to Livy 27. 27) killed in the same reconnaissance as that in which Crispinus was wounded, the absence of any such note from the name of Marcellus—and the later date of the addition in the case of Crispinus—raises an interesting question as to the reason for the absence. It may be, as I have suggested in *Discovery*, that the only reason for the omission was that the event took place so near the end of 208 that no new consuls were *suffecti*; but an editor of Livy's text must not queer the pitch of a nice problem for the professional historians, from whom he is anxious to learn more of the possibilities of the case.'

From Dr. W. Rhys Roberts:

'The *Classical Review* is to be congratulated on the two literary articles which form its special July number; and it is much to be hoped that the Branches of the Classical Association may be able to increase the circulation of the *Review*, so that welcome innovations of this kind may be multiplied. *Apropos* of Mr. E. T. England's paper: is it not the case that not only Euripides but Sophocles (in his lost early plays) sometimes made fun of Aeschylus? How else are we to explain ὁ Σοφοκλῆς . . . τὸν Αἰσχύλου διαπεπαιχῶς ὄγκον in Plutarch, *Mor.* 79B, where διαπεπαιχῶς can hardly mean no more than 'imitate,' though that is the translation usually found in modern Histories of Greek Literature? In his early *Triptolemus* Sophocles wrote ἀπυνδάκωτος οὐ τραπεζοῦται κύλιξ ('a cup unbased is not intabulated'), where the meaning is 'a cup without a bottom is not placed upon a table' (*Demetr. de Eloc.*, § 114). May this bombastic line, which might well seem inconceivable anywhere in a Sophoclean tragedy, have been put, with Aeschylus in mind, in the mouth of some minor character (a drunken servitor, say, from Oenotria; his may be the lines ἦλθεν δὲ δαῖς θάλεια

προσβίστη θεῶν and θεὸς δ' ἐν φρενὶς δέλτοισι τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους) resembling the Φύλαξ in the *Agamemnon*, whose proverbial wisdom appears in βούς ἐπὶ γλώσση μέγας βέβηκεν? And may not such lines, divorced from their context and the homely characters who utter them, have led Graeco-Roman critics to tax, as they do, Sophocles with occasional lapses from his usual dignity? That Sophocles was far from shunning the literary allusiveness, playful or hostile, which pervades Greek writers may be inferred from the use (cp. *C.R.* XVIII. 19) of εὐπέεια, in his *Oed. Tyr.* 932, with direct reference to a catchword of contemporary stylists such as Gorgias. Surely εὐπέεια does not there, and there alone, mean εὐφημία, 'fair greeting.' The new word filled the air in the later years of Sophocles' long life, and had but one sense.'

From a Newcastle correspondent:

'A glance at the volumes of the Classical Association's *Proceedings* reveals the fact that few local Branches of the Association meet after March of each year. Visits during the early summer to places of archaeological interest in the district can, however, be made a pleasant and very valuable close to a year's programme, and most Branches, under modern conditions of travel, will have access to such over a fairly wide area. In this respect the Northumberland and Durham Branch has been taking full advantage of the opportunities offered by a district so rich in historical and archaeological material. For the past three years officially organised excursions have been made; in 1924 and 1925 the chief camps along the line of Hadrian's Wall were visited, and this summer camps north of the Wall, along the line of the "Watling Street," were inspected, including Habitancum and Bremenium. Full explanation by competent guides and free discussion among members and friends have made these experiments a great success.'

We offer a hearty welcome to *Speculum*, the quarterly organ of the newly founded Mediaeval Academy of America. The purpose of this academy is to

conduct and encourage research and instruction in all departments of the arts, letters, and life of the Middle Ages. The President is Professor Rand of Harvard, whose own work illustrates the close interrelation of Classical and Mediaeval studies. From the office of the Academy, Room 312, 248, Boylston Street, Boston, Massachusetts, information will be sent to any person who may be interested in the work of the Academy, or may wish to apply for membership.

The Prime Minister's presidential address to the Classical Association has received the honour of a version in the April number of the *Bulletin de*

*l'Association Guillaume Budé*. It is a pleasure to read it again, in excellent French. The following article, in melancholy contrast, describes *La mort prochaine des humanités en France*. But they will not die. *Τίς οἶδεν εἰ ζῆν τοῦθ' ὃ κέκληται θανεῖν;*

THE Classical Association will meet in Manchester from the 7th to the 9th of October. On Friday, the 8th, at 5.30 p.m., in the University, it will listen to the Presidential Address of the Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart of Bury. Among distinguished guests who will read papers are Professors Rand of Harvard and Jaeger of Berlin.

#### ΠΕΡΙ ΑΛΙΒΑΝΤΩΝ.

##### PART II.

IN my previous article I dealt with the subject of ἀλίβαντες in general; I pass now to the restoration of an ancient story in which the activities of one famous reanimated ἀλίβας are described.

The story as told by Pausanias runs briefly thus: During Odysseus' wanderings he touched at the town of Temesa in South Italy, where one of his comrades, during a fit of drunkenness, violated a girl and was stoned to death by the townsfolk. Odysseus apparently sailed away without stopping to bury him—glad to escape from death with the loss of another dear comrade. But the dead man reappeared, and committed such havoc in the town that the inhabitants thought of evacuating it. The oracle of Delphi however bade them stay, and appease the dead man by erecting a hero's shrine for him and giving him annually the most beautiful girl of the town in marriage. By this means peace was established, and continued for centuries, subject to the continuance of the marriage custom, until Euthymos, the famous boxer, happened to arrive in the town on the very day when the custom was being observed. He went to the shrine, fell in love with the girl who was awaiting the coming of the hero, and ob-

tained her promise to marry him if he should deliver her from him. So Euthymos engaged with the hero on his arrival, and having defeated him delivered the girl and the whole town out of his power.

So much for the outline of the story, by way of indication that it contains promising material; for the purpose of restoring certain details however I must append our present text of Pausanias and Suidas' *précis* of the same story.

##### PAUSANIAS VI. 6. 7-11.

Ἐπανήκων δὲ ἐς Ἱταλίαν, τότε δὴ ἐμαχέσατο πρὸς τὸν Ἥρω. τὰ δὲ ἐς αὐτὸν εἶχεν οὕτως. Ὀδυσσεὰ πλανώμενον μετὰ ἄλσων τὴν Ἰλίου κατενεχθῆναι φασιν ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ἐς τε ἄλλας τῶν ἐν Ἱταλίᾳ καὶ Σικελίᾳ πόλεων, ἀφικέσθαι δὲ καὶ ἐς Τεμέσαν ὁμοῦ ταῖς ναυσὶ· μεθυσθέντα οὖν ἐνταῦθα ἓνα τῶν ναυτῶν παρθένον βιάσασθαι, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων ἀντὶ τούτου καταλευσθῆναι τοῦ ἀδικήματος. Ὀδυσσεὰ μὲν δὴ ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ θέμενον αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀπώλειαν ἀποπλέοντα οἴχεσθαι, τοῦ καταλευσθέντος δὲ ἀνθρώπου τὸν δαίμονα οὐδένα ἀνιέναι καιρὸν ἀποκτείνοντά τε ὁμοίως τοὺς ἐν τῇ Τεμέσῃ καὶ ἐπεξερχόμενον ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἡλικίαν, ἐς δ' ἡ Πυθία τὸ παράπαν ἐξ Ἱταλίας ὠρμημένους φεύγειν Τεμέσαν μὲν ἐκλιπεῖν οὐκ εἶα, τὸν δὲ Ἥρω σφᾶς ἐκέλευσεν ἱλάσκεσθαι, τέμενός τε ἀποτε-



μομένους οἰκοδομήσασθαι ναόν, δίδοναι δὲ κατὰ ἔτος αὐτῷ γυναῖκα τῶν ἐν Τεμέσῃ παρθένων τὴν καλλίστην. τοῖς μὲν δὴ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προστεταγμένα ὑπουργοῦσι δῆμα ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος ἐς τὰλλα ἦν οὐδέν· Εὐθύμος δὲ, ἀφίκετο γὰρ ἐς τὴν Τεμέσαν καὶ πῶς τῆνικαῦτα τὸ ἔθος ἐποιεῖτο τῷ δαίμονι, πυνθάνεται τὰ παρόντα σφίσι, καὶ ἐσελθεῖν τε ἐπεθύμησεν ἐς τὸν ναόν καὶ τὴν παρθένον ἐσελθὼν θεάσασθαι. ὡς δὲ εἶδε, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἐς οἶκτον, δεύτερα δὲ ἀφίκετο καὶ ἐς ἔρωτα αὐτῆς. καὶ ἡ παῖς τε συνοικήσεν κατώμνυτο αὐτῷ σώσαντι αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ Εὐθύμος ἐνσκευασμένος ἔμενε τὴν ἔφοδον τοῦ δαίμονος. ἐνίκα τε δὴ τῇ μάχῃ, καὶ, ἐξηλαύνετο γὰρ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ὁ ἥρωα ἀφανίζεται τε κατὰ δὺς ἐς θάλασσαν, καὶ γάμος τε ἐπιφανῆς Εὐθύμῳ καὶ [ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ἐνταῦθα] ἐλευθερία τοῦ λοιποῦ σφίσιν ἦν ἀπὸ τοῦ δαίμονος . . . . . τὸδε μὲν ἤκουσα, γραφῇ δὲ τοιαύτῃ ἐπιτυχὼν οἶδα· ἦν δὲ αὕτη γραφῆς μίμημα ἀρχαίας. νεανίσκος Σύβαρις καὶ Κάλαβρός τε ποταμὸς καὶ Λύκα πηγὴ, πρὸς δὲ ἡρόφον τε καὶ Τεμέσα ἦν ἡ πόλις, ἐν δὲ σφίσι καὶ δαίμων ὕντινα ἐξέβαλεν ὁ Εὐθύμος, χροῶν τε δεινῶς μέλας καὶ τὸ εἶδος ἅπαν ἐς τὰ μάλιστα φοβερός, λύκου δὲ ἀμπίσχετο δέρμα ἐσθῆτα· ἐτίθετο δὲ καὶ ὄνομα Λύκαν τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ γράμματα.<sup>1</sup>

SUIDAS, s.v. Εὐθύμος.

Οὗτος ὁ Εὐθύμος ἠγωνίσαστο καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἐν Τεμέσῃ ἥρωα Ἀλύβαντα· ἡ δὲ Τέμεσα τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐστίν, εἰς ἣν Ὀδυσσεὺς πλανώμενος περὶ Σικελίαν ἦλθεν. ἐνθα εἰς τῶν ναυτῶν μεθύσας καὶ παρθένον βιασάμενος κατελεύσθη ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων. καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς μὲν ἐν οὐδενὶ θέμενος τὴν ἀπώλειαν ἔπλει· τοῦ δὲ τελευτήσαντος ὁ δαίμων οὐκ ἀνίει τοὺς ἐν Τεμέσῃ ἀνθρώπους ἐπεξερχόμενος καὶ φονεύων· ὥστε καὶ ὥρμησαν φυγεῖν καταλιπόντες τὴν πόλιν, εἰ μὴ ἡ Πυθία σφᾶς ἐπέσχε, τὸν ἥρωα ἰλάσκεσθαι <κελεύουσα> τέμενος ἐργασαμένους καὶ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν τὴν καλλίστην οὔσαν παρθένον ἐς γυναῖκα ἐπιιδόντας. ταῦτα πολλοῖς ἔτεσι τελούμενα πυθόμενος ὁ

<sup>1</sup> My text is that of the Teubner edition, save that I have omitted a comma after ἐξηλαύνετο γὰρ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, and have bracketed ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ἐνταῦθα.

Εὐθύμος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ τέμενος, καὶ τὴν παρθένον ἰδὼν, καὶ οἰκτείρας, πρὸς δὲ καὶ ἐς ἔρωτα ἑλθὼν, ἐνσκευάσατο ὡς πολέμῳ τῷ δαίμονι, καὶ αὐτὸν μὲν νύκτωρ φανέντα ἐνίκησε, καὶ ἐξήλασεν ὡς μηκέτι αὐτόθι φανῆναι, τὴν δὲ παρθένον γαμέτην ἠγάγετο.

A comparison of these two passages will leave no one in doubt that Suidas was here in the main epitomising Pausanias. In the actual story told (apart, that is, from Pausanias' further note about the picture which he saw), Suidas' wording and phrasing constantly repeat those of Pausanias and, abbreviated as his account is, there is only one considerable omission. There are, however, two additions (indicated for convenience, like the passage of Pausanias which is omitted by him, in spaced type) which would suggest at first sight that he had supplemented Pausanias' story with information drawn from some other source. I shall however show that this was not the case, but that he was following an older and better manuscript of Pausanias than we now possess.<sup>2</sup>

The first of these apparent additions is the name Ἀλύβας. How comes it that Suidas speaks of τὸν ἐν Τεμέσῃ ἥρωα Ἀλύβαντα, while Pausanias gives in the course of his story no name, but remarks of the picture that he saw, ἐτίθετο δὲ καὶ ὄνομα Λύκαν τὰ ἐπὶ τῇ γραφῇ γράμματα?

I had satisfactorily reconciled these two readings and completed provisionally this article before I had access to an edition of Pausanias furnished with an *apparatus criticus*. I had pointed out quite rightly that we have to deal with a pretty example of haplography, double haplography affecting both ends of a word, the scribe having compressed ὄνομα ἀλύβαντα τὰ into ὄνομα λύβαντά. But I had proceeded also to charge the same scribe with having let his eye wander to Λύκα πηγὴ or λύκου δέρμα in the preceding sentence, or with having simply mistaken a cursive β for the very similar cursive κ, and so having negligently substituted Λύκαν for λύβαν, when all the time the culprit, the wilful

<sup>2</sup> Our existing MSS. are all of late date.



culprit, was none other than Bekker, aided and abetted, I believe, by every editor since his time. So then let the name of Lycas, unrecorded elsewhere in Greek literature,<sup>1</sup> and invented only by Bekker to suit a man who wore a wolf-skin, disappear from our text; and let the manuscripts which give uniformly *λύβαν τὰ ἐπὶ οἷς λύβαντα ἐπὶ*<sup>2</sup> be accepted as evidence, corroborated as they are by Suidas, that Pausanias wrote *ἀλύβαντα*.

The first of the apparent additions being thus disposed of, I need not labour the point that the second, consisting of the words *νύκτωρ φανέντα*, becomes of little account. No one will suppose that Suidas was at pains to import that little touch from some other version of the story; rather it is to be presumed that the two words ought to be restored in the text of Pausanias between *ἐνίκα τε δὴ* and *τῇ μάχῃ*. Suidas, I am convinced, followed Pausanias only, and followed him faithfully.

We may return then to the word *ἀλύβας* which Pausanias saw written over the figure in the picture; and the question now to be put is whether the superscription was originally intended as a proper name or as a generic term.

Pausanias, on the simplest interpretation of his words, took it for a proper name, inclined thereto possibly by the spelling of the word. But the spelling is of no great importance; for Hesychius<sup>3</sup> testifies to *ἀλύβας* as a by-form of *ἀλίβας* in one at least of its meanings; and from the *Etymologicum Magnum*<sup>4</sup> we infer too that the mythical founder of the city of Alybas in South Italy was himself called Alibas. A variation of spelling therefore existed, at any rate in South Italy with which we are now concerned.

<sup>1</sup> I rely for this statement on Benseler's edition of Pape, *Wörterbuch der griech. Eigennamen*.

<sup>2</sup> The *apparatus criticus* in Hitzig's edition contains the following: *λύβαντα ἐπὶ* s. *λύβαν τὰ ἐπὶ* codd. 'Αλύβαντα e Suida voluit K(uhn) probante S(iebelis), sic vel 'Αλῖβαντα C(lavier), corr. B(ekker) *λύβαν τὰ ἐπὶ*. Hitzig himself, like other modern editors, perversely follows Bekker.

<sup>3</sup> *S.v.* ἀλύβας.

<sup>4</sup> *Etym. Magn.* 579, 29; *s.v.* Μέταβας. Both spellings of the man's name are found together there. See the last paragraph of this article.

On the other hand there is cogent evidence, first, that Alybas was not the proper name of that comrade of Odysseus whose lapses from virtue and exaltation to honour form the plot of our story; secondly, that the author of the picture seen by Pausanias intended the word *ἀλύβας* in its generic sense.

First then Strabo, who (to judge by his description of the *τέμενος* surrounding the *ἡρώον*) had visited the city of Temesa and could speak with first-hand knowledge, states that the hero worshipped there was called Polites. 'Near Temesa,' he says, 'is a hero's shrine, in a thick grove of wild olives, belonging to Polites, one of Odysseus' companions, who is said to have been murdered by the barbarians, and to have become a wrathful avenger (*γενέσθαι βαρύμηνιν*),'<sup>5</sup> borrowing this rare word apparently from Aeschylus' phrase *μέγαν δαίμονα καὶ βαρύμηνιν*,<sup>6</sup> which prepares the way for the explicit mention of an *ἀλάστορ*.<sup>7</sup> So then according to Strabo the people of Temesa believed that this Polites had become an *ἀλάστορ*, a term which, as we have seen, denotes a re-animated *ἀλύβας* in the exercise of his vindictive powers. Pausanias, on the other hand, had not visited Temesa,<sup>8</sup> and the story as narrated to him elsewhere—probably at Olympia in connexion with the statue of the boxer Euthymos—did not, it would seem, preserve the name of Odysseus' comrade.

Secondly then is it likely that the painter of that old picture, of which a copy was seen by Pausanias, had less local knowledge than Strabo? Surely it is hardly probable that such a picture, dealing merely with a local cult in South Italy, and not even with what might have been more famous, the exploit of Euthymos,—for Euthymos had no place in the picture—should have been painted anywhere save in the immediate neighbourhood of the shrine; and, if that is so, the painter must inevitably have

<sup>5</sup> Strabo VI., p. 255, who is followed by Eustath. on Hom. *Od.* I. 185.

<sup>6</sup> *Agam.* 1482.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 1501 and 1508. For the connexion of the word *μῆνις* with *ἀλάστορες* and blood-guilt in general see my *Mod. Greek Folklore*, etc., pp. 447-449.

<sup>8</sup> Paus. VI. 6. 10.

known that the hero's name was Polites. If then he attached to the painted figure the label *ἀλύβας*, he was clearly using that word, not as a proper name, but as a generic term. Moreover his whole conception of the figure which he painted bears this out. He knew presumably that Polites had met with a violent death, and, as we may infer from Odysseus' hasty departure, that his body remained unburied. He knew too presumably, what we have learnt from the *Etymologicum Magnum*, that 'those who met a violent death and those who remained unburied became *ἀλίβαντες*. Equipped with this knowledge, he portrayed the hero as a grim black figure, peculiarly terrifying, and arrayed in a wolf-skin. These traits are clearly not proper to heroes as such, but there are grounds for holding that they were relevant and perhaps essential to the pictorial representation of an *ἀλύβας*.

In establishing this point the existing evidence concerning modern *vrykolakes* is not without value, and there are specific statements on record that *vrykolakes* are sometimes 'livid'<sup>1</sup> or 'black'<sup>2</sup> in colour; while the whole appearance of such a monster is described as being so terrible that 'by its mere aspect, without either speech or touch,' it has been known to kill men.<sup>3</sup> But ancient literature too furnishes corroborative evidence. The philosopher Democritus, according to a story told by Lucian,<sup>4</sup> was so firmly convinced that no supernatural apparitions could exist that he took up his abode in a tomb, and there sat writing day and night; 'and some young men, being minded to play a joke upon him and to give him a scare, dressed themselves up, to look like corpses (*νεκρικῶς*), in black clothes and in masks representing skulls (*κράνα*)' and danced round him; but he, without looking up or stopping his writing, said merely, 'Stop fooling.' Now the passage in itself, though mentioning explicitly corpses and skulls, might leave us in doubt whether the young men were

meant to represent mere spectres<sup>5</sup> or bodily *revenants*; but when in another passage of Lucian<sup>6</sup> we hear of a resolution being proposed in the underworld by one who is described as *Κρανίων Σκελετίωνος Νεκρσιεὺς φυλῆς Ἀλιβαντίδος*, the close correspondence of language must turn the scale in favour of *ἀλίβαντες*. Black then in antiquity was the colour of these beings,<sup>7</sup> and the *revenant* Polites, though raised to the rank of hero, was still properly depicted in black.

Finally the wolf-skin which he wore, a garb in no way characteristic of a hero as such, had, it appears, in ancient religion, both Etruscan and Greek, a conventional association with visitants from the underworld. In Etruscan tomb-paintings Hades himself is 'coiled in a wolf-skin,' and there is evidence that in Greece too a wolf-skin or a cap of wolf-skin was deemed appropriate to Thanatos and to apparitions from the nether world.<sup>8</sup> Possibly the famous 'cap of Hades,' which conferred on the wearer invisibility, was only a reduced form of his Etruscan dress.

If then the artist who painted that black and ferocious figure, garbed as a denizen of the underworld, added to it the superscription ΑΛΤΒΑΣ, can any doubt remain as to what he meant? The shrine of Polites was, I presume, commonly spoken of as τὸ ἡρώιον τοῦ ἀλύβαντος, and the artist did well to omit a very commonplace proper name and to employ the familiar description instead.

My proof then is now complete; but my restoration of Pausanias' text involves yet one more correction. There is evidence that some annotator of Pausanias, of later date than Suidas,

<sup>5</sup> Spectres (*εἰδῶλα*) are also sometimes described as black; cf. Dio Cassius, LXVII. 9. 2.

<sup>6</sup> *Menippus*, 20.

<sup>7</sup> Mr. A. B. Cook has kindly pointed out to me that on a South Italian vase (Naples 3249) Clytemnestra is depicted in black. Clytemnestra had every cause for returning as an *ἀλύβας*, but the intention of the artist cannot be ascertained in this case; cf. note 5 above.

<sup>8</sup> A. B. Cook, *Zeus* I., p. 99, where the Etruscan Hades is figured and the Greek evidence collected. I am indebted to Mr. Cook for calling my attention to this interpretation of the wolf-skin.

<sup>1</sup> *Mod. Greek Folklore*, etc., p. 366.

<sup>2</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 370.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 365; cf. pp. 367, 369, etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Philopseudes*, 32.

but working on a manuscript which still retained the word ἀλίβαντα uncorrupted in its text, understood that word in its generic sense, but added a marginal comment, itself erroneous, which has become part of our existing text.

I pointed out above that, of the three substantial discrepancies between Suidas and Pausanias in the texts which I exhibited, two consisted in apparent additions made by Suidas, and the remaining one in an equally considerable omission. But those apparent additions, we saw, were not in fact additions made by Suidas, but represented his faithful reproduction of the story as he read it in a better manuscript than any which we now possess. It is worth while therefore to ask ourselves whether that phrase which Suidas entirely ignores, ἀφανίζεται τε καταδὸς ἐς θάλασσαν, formed perhaps no part of the text which Suidas had before him, but is merely a gloss wrongly incorporated in our own text.

For this view there is some curiously interesting evidence. It should be noted perhaps first in passing that the construction of the whole sentence, as I have given it above, is unsatisfactory, the καί before γάμος being redundant; and that to punctuate, as does the Teubner text,<sup>1</sup> with a comma after ἐκ τῆς γῆς, is merely to salve formal grammar at the cost of the whole balance of the sentence. This defect may have been occasioned by the intrusion of a gloss. What Pausanias meant to say was that Euthymos was the victor in the fight, and that, the hero being driven out of the land, Euthymos married the girl who had been destined for the hero and the people of Temesa were freed from his impositions. The question then is whether Pausanias himself added to the statement that 'the hero was driven out of the land' the further information that 'he plunged into the sea and disappeared,' or if this latter phrase is a gloss.<sup>2</sup>

My answer is that it is a gloss on the

actual word ἀλίβαντα. Some reader or copyist of Pausanias asked himself why the hero who was driven out of the land by Euthymos was labelled in the picture as an ἀλίβας. We may grant, if we will, that he knew the ordinary meaning of that word; we may grant that he may have known what we have learnt from the *Etymologicum Magnum*, that ἀλίβαντες comprised as one class those who had met their death in the sea (τοὺς ἐν θαλάσῃ τελευτήσαντας).<sup>3</sup> Yet even so, whatever his degree of expert knowledge, he might still have been at a loss to understand how a term ordinarily applied to the sere and withered corpse of some unfortunate human being could become applicable to one whom Pausanias depicts as a very lively δαίμων.

This point in itself, the usage of δαίμων, need not detain us; for, as Sir J. G. Frazer has remarked in a note on the story in question, 'no one word in English bears all the meanings of δαίμων, which must be translated variously according to the context';<sup>4</sup> it meant in fact any supernatural being. Frazer in this very story rendered it by 'ghost,' a sense which, in the phrase τοῦ καταλευσθέντος ἀνθρώπου τὸν δαίμονα, it might undoubtedly bear, were it not that the whole context, when fully examined in the light now thrown upon it by my discussion of ἀλίβαντες, demands rather some word denoting a corporeal revenant.

I suggest then that our supposed reader of Pausanias was at a loss to reconcile the term δαίμων, which suggested to him some divine or spiritual being, with the term ἀλίβας, which suggested a withered human corpse. He failed to see that an ἀλίβας resuscitated became *ipso facto* an ἀλάστωρ,<sup>5</sup> and that an ἀλάστωρ may certainly be called a δαίμων—failed, perhaps, because he did not know that ἀλίβαντες were even liable to resuscitation. He had in fact, I suppose, inverted the whole problem, and was trying to account for a δαίμων becoming

<sup>1</sup> So also Hitzig and others.

<sup>2</sup> Our text clearly includes one other gloss, viz. ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ἐνταῦθα, a mere explanation of the pronoun σφίσι. I have bracketed it accordingly.

<sup>3</sup> See my previous article.

<sup>4</sup> Frazer, *Pausanias' Description of Greece*. Vol. IV., p. 24.

<sup>5</sup> See my previous article.

an *άλιβας*, and so in his perplexity had recourse to the lexicographers.

There, in Hesychius for example, immediately after the explanation of the word *άλιβαντες*, he would have found two apparently kindred words: *άλιβατεί*, says Hesychius = *ἀφανίζει*, and *άλιβδύσαι* (*sic*) = *ἀφανίσαι*. Or again in Suidas, immediately after the explanation of *άλιβας*, he would have found: *άλιβδύειν* = τὸ καταδύνειν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν. μεταφορικῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ κρύπτειν καὶ ἀφανίζειν. παρὰ τὴν ἅλα καὶ τὸ δύνειν, πλεονασμῷ τοῦ β' Αἰολικῶς.

Now I am not maintaining that Hesychius and Suidas, by the mere juxtaposition of the words which they explained, committed themselves to maintaining any etymological affinity of *άλιβδύειν* with *άλιβας*, but it is hard to avoid the conclusion that our reader fell into the error of relating *άλιβδύειν* to *άλιβας* as verb to substantive. 'So then,' he said to himself, 'an *άλιβας* is any being who *άλιβδύει* (or *άλιβδύεται*)—sinks into the sea and disappears. That explains why Pausanias says *ἐξηλαύνετο γὰρ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ὁ Ἥρω*, and what he meant. The hero was driven not merely 'out of the land' but 'off the earth,' and the necessary implication is that he disappeared into the sea and was in that sense an *άλιβας*.' And accordingly he appended his marginal note against the word *άλιβαντα*, quoting first from the text *ἐξηλαύνετο γὰρ ἐκ τῆς γῆς ὁ Ἥρω* and adding, with a noticeable change of tense, in words borrowed directly from Suidas, *ἀφανίζεται τε καταδύς ἐς θάλασσαν*.

Will any cautious critic reject my exposure of this gloss as too ingenious? Then let him try to digest two amazing coincidences: first, that in the only complete extant story concerning an *άλιβας* there happens to be found a phrase which in substance repeats information given by Suidas *s.v.* *άλιβδύειν* immediately after the word *άλιβας*; and second, that Suidas *s.v.* *Εὐθυμος* in his careful *précis* of that same story happened to ignore that phrase and that phrase only.

Once more then Suidas comes to our aid, though accidentally this time, in reconstructing the original text of Pausanias' story. The only mistake made by Suidas was in taking Alybas to be the proper name of the hero—a mistake into which Pausanias himself, it would seem, had already fallen. Yet it is just possible that Pausanias was writing loosely, and merely meant that by way of appellation there was the superscription *άλύβας* in its normal generic sense. So at any rate his phrase was read by the author of the gloss with which I have dealt; and the evidence of Strabo concerning the hero's real name, coupled with the evidence provided by the actual portrayal of the grim black figure with its dress of wolf-skin in the picture itself, can leave no doubt that, as now emended and interpreted, Pausanias' story of Euthy-mos must rank as a *locus classicus* *περὶ ἀλιβάντων*.

A conjecture concerning the genesis of this story may deserve a postscript. According to Eustathius,<sup>1</sup> the city of Alybas mentioned by Homer was that which was afterwards known as Metapontum. Now the reputed founder of Metapontum was one Metabos, and Metabos, according to one authority, was the son of Alibas.<sup>2</sup> This genealogy clearly suggests that Alibas was the reputed founder of the earlier city, and a cult of that founder with the rank of hero might well have continued in Metapontum after the city received its new name. Is it not possible that the cult of the hero Alibas had spread to the not distant city of Temesa, and that in course of time the personality of Alibas was forgotten there, while τὸ ἥρῳον τοῦ Ἀλίβαντος, *alias* τοῦ Ἀλύβαντος, was still frequented as a shrine, needing an aetiological legend to explain its origin?

J. C. LAWSON.

<sup>1</sup> Eustath. in *Od.* XXIV. 304, p. 1961, 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Etym. Magn.*, *s.v.* *Μεταβος*, see note above on the spelling of *άλύβας*. My attention was called to this by Pearson on *Soph. Fr.* 790.



ON TACITUS, *HISTORIES* II. 20.

Ornatum ipsius municipia et coloniae in superbiam trahebant quod uersicolori sagulo *bracas barbarum tegmen* indutus togatos adloqueretur.

ON this part of the description of the un-Roman garb of Caecina, Gerber and Greef, *s.u.* 'tegmēn,' have the following note: 'M. tegmēn; Walther, Nipp., Meiser tegmen; Ritter, Halm, Her. del. barb. teg.' We may agree with the athetisers that neither Tacitus nor any contemporary of Caecina would, after a mention of *bracae*, have thought it necessary to point out that 'breeks' were a *barbarum tegmen*; but we must ask them to explain what scribe or annotator having *bracas* before him would have glossed it thus. Turn it round, and we see that it is *barbarum tegmen* which required explanation and that *bracas* was the gloss. Tacitus here, as so often elsewhere, is drawing inspira-

tion from Vergil. In *A.* II. 777, the outlandish opponent of the Italian virago Camilla, '*peregrina* ferrugine clarus et ostro,' is described as '*pictus acu tunicas et barbara tegmina crurum*,' the upper garment being named, as here, and the lower indicated by periphrasis.

Between the forms *tegmen* (*tegumen*) and *tegmēn* the choice is not so easy. In early Latin the declension was *tegmen* \**tegmēnis*, and *tegmēnis* arose from the same syncopation which produced *cūlminis* from *cōluminis*, etc. (Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 185), and *bālneum* from *bālīneum*. Hence *tegmen* sprang up later by *tegmēn*, as *cūlmen* by *cōlumen*, first in Lucretius' textile tegmen, 5. 1350, and Verg. *A.* 7. 689 (P. has 'tegmēna'). Tacitus, however, has the fuller form elsewhere, and this has the countenance of *regimen* (thirteen occurrences), which, we may observe, is in classical usage a monoptote, like *specimen*, though the lexicons present both with a genitive.

J. P. POSTGATE.

## REVIEWS

## GREEK ETHICAL THOUGHT.

*Greek Ethical Thought from Homer to the Stoics.* By HILDA D. OAKELEY, M.A., Oxon., Reader in Philosophy in King's College, University of London. Pp. xxxviii + 226. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1925. (The Library of Greek Thought.)

AN introduction of some thirty pages gives a penetrating survey of the development within the period named, and suggests points of contact or contrast with more modern systems. Relevant extracts from Greek authors are then set forth chronologically in translation. Miss Oakeley inevitably suffers from lack of space, but by the side of Philolaus, Bacchylides, and Simonides — whose introduction to English readers consists of "The spirit of Simonides' poetry is thought to be noblest in Greek lyric poetry" — space might perhaps have been found for evidence yielded by Pindar, Aristophanes, Herodotus, or the orators. Plato and Aristotle rightly receive fullest measure, but one wonders (for instance) whether, when the latter's analogous treatment of other virtues has been well illustrated, part of the space devoted to his discussion of liberality might not, with gain of interest, have been spared for citation

from Theophrastus (e.g., ἀνελευθερία or αἰσχροκέρδεια), and whether the Cynics and Cyrenaics deserved to be completely ignored. A few lines from Cleanthes' hymn have perhaps better claim to appear than some of the second-hand Stoic evidence given.

Many of the extracts are drawn from standard translations, but Miss Oakeley ventures into the field herself, not always with happy result. 'God is day and night . . . plenty and hunger. But He changes Himself as the fire when it is mingled with smoke and has the name of each at pleasure' (p. 34). Heracleitus' point is destroyed by a misunderstanding of θύωμα and ἡδονή (Diels, *Fr.* 67). So, too, despite a context stressing the control of the other 'arts' by Politics, *χρωμένης δὲ ταύτης ταῖς λοιπαῖς [πρακτικαῖς] τῶν ἐπιστημῶν* (*Eth. Nic.* I. 2) is rendered 'the rest of the practical arts make use of this' (p. 144), while ἀπόλαυσις παίδων καὶ γυναικῶν (Usener, *Epicurea*, p. 64) becomes 'the enjoyments of children and women' (p. 194). When the ὁρθὸς λόγος διὰ πάντων ἐρχόμενος of the Stoics is described as ὁ αὐτὸς ὢν τῷ Διὶ (Diog. Laert. VII. 87), these last words appear as 'the same for God' (p. 204), and when the Stoic view of happiness as



independent of duration is dealt with, καὶ <ἐκείνων> τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν μὴ διαφέρειν τῆς θείας εὐδαιμονίας μηδὲ τὴν ἡμετέραν διαφέρειν τῆς τοῦ Διὸς εὐδαιμονίας (Stob. Eclog. II. 98, 17 W.) becomes 'the happiness of the former differs in no way from the divine happiness, nor its character as indivisible' (p. 205). The last words make nonsense to any reader, the true meaning being 'nor does that which is momentary differ from the happiness of Zeus' (i.e., that which is eternal). In the *Nicomachean Ethics* ἐνέργεια is constantly translated 'energy,' which, while it must in almost every case mislead a Greekless reader, results in English like 'we ought to perform the appropriate energies' (p. 153). Again, 'when the soul is at peace' (p. 188) does not adequately render the first clause of *ἐταν ὁ δαίμων εὖ διδῶ, τί δέι φίλων* (*Eth. Nic.* IX. 9, cf. *Eur. Or.* 665 ff.), however well we may understand the original implications of εὐδαιμονία. In defiance of the context (*Eth. Nic.* VIII. 8), φιλόφιλοι is translated 'lovers of love' (p. 185), and without explanatory note, ὁ ἴσος as the 'equal man' (p. 175). Of the same order is the rendering of αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχαὶ τῶν πρακτῶν τὸ οὐ ἔνεκα τὰ πρακτά (*Eth. Nic.* VI. 5) by the cryptic 'the prin-

ciples of practice constitute the final end of action' (p. 180).

The style of the introductory matter is often vigorous but not always lucid and graceful. We read of Plato's definition of justice as 'the doing by every individual of his own thing' (p. xxxiii), presumably τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν (*Rep.* IV. 433A), and on the same page (179) we find 'the outcome of an experience of unswerving following of the same course,' and 'the difference between the most characteristic standpoint of Greek and modern ethics.' The source of each extract is given, but the references have gone awry on p. 196, and are lacking on pp. 52 and 190. The ascription of sayings of Bias (τοῦ Βίαντος) and Anacharsis to Bian (p. 176) and Anaxagoras (p. 147) respectively, is probably due to misprint or oversight. A bibliography with reference to the more exhaustive discussions of the subject by Schmidt, Ziegler, Wundt, etc., would have been of use to those inspired to seek further. Despite these defects the book will nevertheless achieve what appears to be its object, will help the English reader to some understanding of what the Greeks thought in the sphere of morals.

R. B. ONIANS.

#### EPISTLES OF PLATO.

*Thirteen Epistles of Plato*: Introduction, Translation and Notes. By L. A. Post, M.A. One Vol. Pp. 167. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. 5s. net.

AN English translation of the Platonic *Epistles* has long been wanted, especially in view of the increasing certainty, due to the work of recent scholars, that all the more important letters are genuine. Mr. Post has given us what is in the main an accurate and readable version, though the obscurities and tortuous expressions in which Plato delighted in his latest writings make any translator's task a hard one. A few doubtful renderings may be noted: 319 D εἰπεῖν ἐναργῶς seems, in view of the context, to mean not 'to put down in black and white,' but 'to make anyone see';

323 B δίκη τε καὶ αἰδοῖ means 'by appealing to justice and honour,' the datives being instrumental with συμ-φύσαι καὶ συνδῆσαι; 334 B βαναύσου φιλότητος is rather 'commonplace' than 'low-bred' friendship: it means much the same as τῆς περιτρεχούσης ἐταιρίας in 333 E; 334 D ἀνελεύθερα is not 'short-sighted' but 'ungenerous'; 325 C ἔπειθον can hardly mean 'I convinced'; 336 D πιστόν τι καὶ ὑγιές = 'reliable and sound,' not 'righteous'; and in the same section εἰ δ' οὖν ταῦτα μὲν ὕστερα γένοιτ' ἂν cannot mean 'if it is too late to resort to these measures.' In 354 C, 'put on the form of a king,' and in 357 C, 'gently and by every means,' are not very happy phrases. In the rare cases where the translator has adopted or suggested emendations he seems

justified, though the reading adopted in 335 B involves an impossible usage of ἡλικον, which the parallels cited are inadequate to support.

The introductions prefixed to each letter are admirable for their lucidity and insight, and the notes at the end of the book are most helpful. Mr. Post's solution of the chief difficulty in the eighth letter—the mention of Dion's son in 355 E—is very plausible: he believes that the reference is to Dion's posthumous son 'who flits across the page of history nameless and unfortunate.' There is also an interesting discussion of the relation of the seventh letter to Isocrates' *Antidosis*; Mr. Post is surely right in holding that the close similarity between Isocrates' eulogy of

Timotheus and Plato's of Dion, which seems to have passed hitherto unnoticed, cannot be mere coincidence.

The author is perhaps somewhat too ready to pronounce in favour of the authenticity of some of the shorter letters—e.g., the tenth; and the 'fine seriousness about small matters' which he notes in the thirteenth will perhaps appear to most readers to deserve a harsher name. This letter seems destined to remain an enigma; it is so uncharacteristic of the common forger, and yet it is hard to believe that Plato after a few months' acquaintance with Dionysius could have lectured him in this paternal fashion. But Mr. Post's candour, here and elsewhere, is not the least commendable feature of his work.

R. HACKFORTH.

#### THE FOURTH ENNEAD OF PLOTINUS.

*Plotinus on the Nature of the Soul, being the fourth Ennead, translated from the Greek by STEPHEN MACKENNA.* London: The Medici Society, Ltd., 1924. 31s.

PLOTINUS is indebted for such limited popularity as he enjoys in England almost exclusively to the work of two men—Dean Inge and Mr. MacKenna. The work of these two students is so different that it would be futile to attempt to compare them; but it may be contended that Mr. MacKenna has chosen the harder part; to expound so difficult a writer as Plotinus is easier than to translate him; the expositor may systematise and may use his own language, the translator must follow all the twists and turns of one of the most nimble and elusive intellects of all time. In the fourth Ennead, Mr. MacKenna has to tackle the crucial part of the system of Plotinus. In this Ennead, Plotinus deals with the soul, and it is at this point that the system breaks down. In spite of every refinement of thought and every brilliant artifice of argument, Plotinus has not been able to bridge the inevitable lacuna. The Greek dislike of any association between matter and spirit, which was so strong that not even the Christian Platonists ever frankly accepted the principle of Incarnation, has seduced Plotinus into hold-

ing in different books, and even in the same book, two fundamentally irreconcilable doctrines of the soul and its relation to the body. To thread the mazes which fringe the brink of the yawning chasm, to give the English reader any clue through the intricacies of the argument, is a task of overwhelming difficulty. As most of this review will be taken up with criticisms, it is fair to say at the outset that Mr. MacKenna has done his work so well on the whole that no one should attempt to do it again for at least a hundred years.

From the fact that the translation is published without any notes or summaries, it will necessarily be useful, not so much to the ordinary reader, who can hardly face Plotinus at all without elaborate aids, as to students, who can test by the Greek this accurate rendering which, like the Oxford Aristotle, is sometimes hardly intelligible without reference to the original. If this be the aim, the translator is greatly to be commended for his fidelity to the Greek, and his general restraint of language. The level of style is very well maintained; there are comparatively few unintelligible sentences—that is to say, Mr. MacKenna is brave enough to let us see what he takes Plotinus to mean, and so submits to our judgment. Occasionally sentences like 'there is nothing

against ascribing acts of memory and experiences of sense to them, in supposing them to accept the traction of methods laid up in the natural order' (p. 99) make us catch our breath; Mr. MacKenna not infrequently uses unnecessarily long and strange words; *ἐν σπηλαίῳ εἶναι* surely need not disappear under 'encavement'; and *πρὸ ὁμμάτων εἶναι ἐργάζεται* is rather over-emphasised by being rendered 'elaborates them into visibility.' It is too a pity that Mr. MacKenna should spoil really good sentences by placing them side by side with really bad ones; as in the following example: 'There is, besides, no principle that can prevent anything from partaking, to the extent of its own individual receptivity, in the Nature of Good. If therefore matter has always existed, that existence is enough to ensure its participation in the being which, according to each receptivity, communicates the supreme good universally' (p. 151). But the passages where an allowable ingenuity has transformed tortuous Greek into excellent and even impressive English are enough to compensate for very many more than the few lapses to be found in this book.

I propose to append specimens of the detailed criticisms which occurred to me in working carefully through the translation with the Greek text. It will be seen that they fall under three headings. I am sometimes in uncertainty as to the text which Mr. MacKenna translates. By his office, he is exonerated from citing the text; but there is a tendency among scholars to try and make sense in Plotinus of what is neither Greek nor sense, and since I have with me in India only Volkmann's text of 1884, I should have been grateful to know when Mr. MacKenna is translating manuscripts and when conjectures. Secondly, in places he seems to me negligent of minor matters of Greek scholarship. One such matter is really of considerable importance for the argument—namely, the constant suppression of the word *οἶον*. Plotinus, being a man of most concrete and imaginative mind, constantly has occasion to remind himself and his

readers that his system is distinct from the artistry which he weaves round it; as reminder, he generally uses this word *οἶον*. It may be agreed that to reproduce it in English is cumbersome; but Bishop Westcott had an exactly parallel habit of interjecting 'as we speak' whenever he used figurative or anthropomorphic language. Finally, there are passages where Mr. MacKenna's rendering, though obtainable from the Greek, does not seem to me to fit the argument. (The references are to Volkmann's Teubner Edition, 1884).

21. 16. 'Has no act of its own.' M. No; 'cannot make its own that in which it is'—the very point of the net which cannot hold water.

24. 9. 'In unity itself there may still be distinction.' M. What does he read? *συνεῖναι χωρὶς ὅν* can surely mean nothing but 'to be united, though partially separated.'

115. 14. *ἀντιλήψεις* and *αἰσθήσεις*, both translated 'perception,' are not the same thing.

116. 11. *ἀλλὰ τὸ δυνήθῃναι καὶ ἐφ' ὃ τέτακται ἐργάσασθαι*, 'within its allotted sphere to act.' M. This misses the force of *καὶ*, and so the anaphora of *δυνάμει* . . . *δυνήθῃναι*.

117. 29. *μνημονεύειν μᾶλλον*, 'have long memory.' Impossible. How can children have long memories? Simply, 'are more apt to remember.'

117. 31. *ὅπω εἰς πλῆθος ἀλλὰ πρὸς ὀλίγα*, 'the attention is limited, but not scattered.' M. Where is *ὅπω*? The subject is not attention, but memory. They have only a few things to remember as yet, and so remember them easily.

144. 11. *ἐνδυνατᾷ*, 'has its activity.' M. That is *ἐνεργεῖται*; *ἐνδ.* is surely 'sojourns': the activity of soul is to escape from body.

145. 7. 'Absorbs much of the nature.' M. *ἀναπιμπλάσθαι*. It depends on the size of a bucket whether, when full, it holds much or little water.

147. 24. *ἐνός τινος*, 'one form of being.' M. Better 'one individual entity.'

147. 11. *δεῖ* is surely necessary both to construction and to argument.

150. 5. *μετ' αὐτό* V., 'their own nexts.' M. presumably reading *μετ' αὐτά*; but is the sense as good?

It may be said that these are carping criticisms: but many people believe, because Plotinus wrote curious Greek, that he wrote inexact Greek, and this does not seem to me to be the case. It is true that it is often necessary to reconstruct the true text from the argument; but the argument must first be established by close scrutiny of every jot and tittle of the text where it is sound, before we can venture to restore order to the text where the scribes have made chaos of it.

S. C. NEILL.

## A GREEK EPHEMERIS.

*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, moderantibus P. ROUSSEL, M. N. TOD, E. ZIEBARTH, adiuvantibus [thirteen scholars], redigendum curavit J. J. E. Hondius. Vols. I. and II., pp. 161 and 169. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1924, 1925. 10s. per vol.

It is needless to praise the enthusiasm, energy, and industry of this international team, in which England is represented so appropriately by Oxford and so competently by Mr. Tod. The second fascicule of Vol. II. brings the number of inscriptions up to 1,475, and opens with the above distribution of functions among the collaborators; in the earlier fascicules the functions were distributed differently. There is a Dutch editor, moderators representing England, France, and Germany, and a goodly company of adjutors, including Cumont, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, and Wilhelm. The *Supplementum* is in safe hands, and the debt under which all Greek scholars are laid will mount up with each new issue. It is with a fitting sense of gratitude that the present reviewer, some of whose private criticisms on points of detail were given effect to on p. 140 of Vol. I., would venture to suggest a few respects in which the presentation of the new texts and the composition of the notes might be made even better than they are.

Inscriptions are not MSS.; their evidence is contemporary, and, if clear, ultimate; minor slips in the engraving are easily controlled, and noted in the usual way by ( ) and < >, or, better, by *sic*; and it is only in well-defined groups of inscriptions that the copy which lies behind really faulty engraving is so obvious, or so fully sponsored by a duplicate or by other evidence, as to be worth reproduction in the text, or even in the notes. These are truisms; yet too much precious space in these volumes has been conceded to mere dissatisfaction with what the engraver has bequeathed to us. Thus in the new 'taurobolic' inscription from Rome, Vol. II., No. 518 (Rose's brilliant interpretation in *J.H.S.* XLV., p. 180, should now be added to the literature), the first pentameter ends with *τοῦτο*

φέρω τὸ θῦμα. Crönert observes 'ne quis corrigat τοῦτο τὸ θῦμα φέρω monendum θῦμα iam Herodiano . . . notum fuisse.' Excellent; but is the copyist, engraver, or composer to be called to account every time that a form or a construction is unfamiliar as well as distasteful to Mr. Crönert? I have an uneasy feeling that it may be so. Such a practice is regrettable, for if unchecked it leads to the discrediting or suppression of interesting local forms, and reduces the rich variety of Greek or 'graecised' epigraphical usage to a norm dictated by the grammarians, metricians, and Pape-Benseler. Excellent examples of the opposite method are Mr. Crönert's own note on Vol. II., No. 738 (on which see below), and Mr. Tod's note on *ibid.*, No. 724, where unfaithful editors are recalled to their copies. Mr. Crönert's notes on Vol. I., Nos. 448-463 (to select a patch on which I am in a position to arbitrate between critic and engraver), are eloquent throughout of his unfamiliarity with the poetasters of the Anatolian plateau, and sometimes descend to mere *πολυπραγμοσύνη*. No. 461 is a rude village epitaph, with the line *ἄμμα σωφροσύνης τέρμα τελοῦσα μόνη*. Did I say *τελοῦσα*? '*μολοῦσα* corr. censet Cr.' says the *Supp. Epig. Gr.* Does Mr. Crönert mean (a) that *μολοῦσα* was on the stone; or (b) that *μολοῦσα* was in the copy given to the engraver; or (c) that if the composer had known his business, or had been to the University of Athens, he would have written *μολοῦσα*? If the learned writers of such notes would sit down for half an hour and ask themselves 'What do I mean by "corr. censeo" as applied to an inscription?' I feel confident that much valuable space would be set free for the proper uses of a *Supp. Epig. Gr.* It is fair to add that the *Supplementum* owes much to Mr. Crönert's critical acumen and vast learning—e.g., on Vol. II., No. 678. On Vol. I., No. 464, l. 16, I am myself his debtor.

I add a few notes on details.

Vol. I., No. 78, l. 3. *εὐρέι νάσωι* in a restoration Bonus dormitat Wilhelmus.



*Ibid.*, No. 449 (p. 140). It really ought not to be necessary to point out that *Εὐθετίων* does not imply a proper name *Εὐθετος*.

Vol. II. No. 398. *Νερούα* = *Nervae*. As well accent the *β* in *Φλάβιος*, oftener written *Φλάουιος*.

No. 488 (Kertsch). '*Μασᾶς* a *μασάομαι*.' The name, of unknown 'accent,' written in Greek letters as *Μασας* occurs in Anatolia, and has as good a claim to kinship with *μασάομαι* as e.g. *Μασων* has with *Mason* or *Μασαρις* with *Masaryk*.

No. 666. When an epigraphist of Keil's sound instinct hesitates between two explanations, both stand condemned. Read *συνώρια εὐχαριστοῦσιν*? The meaning is uncertain, but the word is the same as that restored with certainty by Anderson in *Studies in E.R.P.*, p. 128.

No. 669. The note suppresses the editor's reference to local parallels for the phrase *ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἀνέστησε βωμόν*, and substitutes an explanation which will occur to anyone unacquainted with the local usage.

No. 690. *φροντίδα* [*ύγής* vel [*νέος* vel simile quid.

No. 710, l. 10. Anatolian names are better (with Sundwall) left unaccented; but if *Γαλατων* is accented, it should be as accusative. Only one *Γαλατω* was in question. With *ποιείτωσαν κλήρον Γαλατων* cf. Aesch. *Agam.* 814 ff. The connection of this name with *Γαλαξῷ*, in support of which *Ζεὺς Γαλάκτινος* might have been quoted (*J.R.S.* II., p. 248), is very doubtful; it is more likely to be *Γα-Λατω*; cf.

*Δημήτηρ* and *Γδανμαα* (*J.H.S.* XXXI., p. 193). The feminine personal name *Γη* is common in Asia Minor, and perhaps appears in Pisidia as *Γα* (Sundwall, *Einheim. Namen*, p. 92). Was *Λατω* the Pisidian word for 'mother'? The priestess took the name of the goddess, just as the priest at Pessinus was called *Attis*.

No. 738. *ύγῳ* (rather than *υ[ί]ῳ*) Cr., following the copy. The same form occurs twice near Laodicea Combusta, once in a Phrygian inscription *J.H.S.* XXXIII., p. 98, once in an unpublished Greek inscription (Calder, 1925).

No. 745. *Ἰουλιαν[οῦ Π]άνσα* (*ἀν-κτ[ί]σιν* *αν(τος)* or *Πάνσα* <*ν*> *κτ[ί]σιν* *αν(τος)*? Cf. No. 824, and, for a similar tangle, *Studies in E.R.P.*, p. 309.

No. 747. Read *ἰς Μητέραν*, Artemis of the Lake.

No. 748 fin. *Ἐρμῇ τ[οῖς] μνησθησο-μένοις*. Cf. *J.R.S.*, XIV., p. 34.

No. 750. The bibliography should include Ramsay's papers in *Athenaeum*, 1911, August 12, *J.H.S.* XXXII., pp. 151 ff., *A.B.S.A.* XVIII., pp. 37 ff., *J.R.S.* VIII., pp. 107 ff.

No. 769. Read *οὐ τόπος* (*τέταρτος*) *προλέληπτε*, a 'clipped' or an incomplete text?

No. 874, l. 2. *Δστη* is nom. prop. as in Kaibel *Ep. gr.* 557. *Ibid.*, l. 5. Why *sic*? 'Of these (16) years she was 15 when she was married.'

No. 883. . . . *Γιάν[νη] π[ρο]τίκτωρος κόσμον τὸν ἄκοσ(μο)ν κο[σ]μήσαντι*. On *κόσμος ἄκοσμος* see the references in *L.S.* from the *Anth. Pal.* John was a *protector*.

W. M. CALDER.

### THE WANDERING SCHOLAR.

*The Wandering Scholar*. By D. G. HOGARTH. Pp. 274. Oxford: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1925. 8s. 6d. net.

MR. HOGARTH does well to republish the gist of two books well known to classical scholars, the original *Wandering Scholar* of 1896, and the *Accidents of an Antiquary's Life* (1910). To an experience of archaeological travel which in its variety is probably unique and in its productiveness rivals Ram-

say's own, Mr. Hogarth adds the literary gift which placed the *Wandering Scholar* on many bookshelves by the side of *Eothen*. The chapter on the Anatolian Turk, reprinted with a half apology, has always seemed to the present writer to be closely connected with that other well-remembered chapter on the Trials of a Scholar, and to have been conceived in the same atmosphere of 'fitful dozing among the insects and heavy-hanging stench.'



The contrast between modern decay and former prosperity, which was so much in evidence when Mr. Hogarth travelled, owed much to two causes, from one of which the Anatolian is now trying hard to free himself, for the other of which he is not responsible—the paralysing grip of Moslem ecclesiasticism, and the discovery and progressive development of the sea-route to the East. The sheer character, industrious habits, and self-respect of the Anatolian peasantry made Anatolia a pleasant land in the past, and may do so again. The double error on p. 22, in which the Phrygian language is still

described as 'the speech of Lycaonia in which Paul spoke to the men of Lystra,' might have been jettisoned. Nor does repetition reconcile me to Mr. Hogarth's assurance (p. 31) that at Tat Kōi he 'watched the sun go down over the great earth-sea of the Central Plains' which lie due east of Tat Kōi. Respect for the word written in a diary doubtless explains the retention of such slips; and they interfere as little with our enjoyment of a thrilling tale as the dawn coming up like thunder out of China 'cross the bay does with our pleasure in the music of Mandalay.

W. M. CALDER.

#### KROLL ON LATIN LITERATURE.

*Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur.* By W. KROLL. Pp. 390. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1924. Paper, 8.50 M.; bound, 10 M.

THESE contributions to the study of Latin literature are what they profess to be—a collection of materials of which the historian of Latin literature ought to take account, and which indeed he cannot afford to neglect. Professor Kroll has done his work with great thoroughness, though he modestly disclaims the attempt to exhaust the subject; every chapter teems with the results of minute study, and bears testimony not only to the scholarship but also to the sound commonsense of the writer. The field of observation is very wide. It is an axiom of modern enquiry on this subject that, if Latin literature is to be scientifically appraised, every department of it must be examined in relation to the corresponding department of Greek literature—especially that of Hellenistic times. An earlier essay by Dr. Kroll, entitled 'Unsere Schätzung der römischen Dichtung,' may be said to be replaced by the maturer thought on this subject contained in the present volume.

It is impossible within the limits of a brief review to do much more than give an outline of the contents and main drift of this volume. To criticise it would involve a discussion of a multitude of special treatises which here come up for review. Dr. Kroll's know-

ledge of the literature of his subject is comprehensive: the only omission that I have noticed is the *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, by Mr. Powell and Mr. Barber. The former's *Collectanea Alexandrina* was not published till the year after Dr. Kroll's *Studien* had appeared.

After four interesting chapters, entitled 'Romans and Greeks,' 'Poetic Creation,' 'The Material of Poetry,' and 'The Moralising Tendency of Poetry,' there follows a chapter on 'Grammatical and Rhetorical Theories'—which are regarded as having exercised a bad influence on literature through their pedantry, their purism, and their tendency to a slavish worship of the *δεδοκιμασμένη συνήθεια* of the past. On the other hand, Dr. Kroll recognises that Cicero, Caesar, and Horace maintained a wholesome independence of narrowing grammatical doctrines; and also that the rhetoricians played a part in developing the art of pointed and epigrammatic speech, which is such a prominent feature of Latin literature (p. 108 f.). After a chapter on 'Poets and Critics' we come to 'Imitation,' with an excursus on anachronisms. Here both the Hellenistic Greeks and the Romans are sharply criticised; but it is recognised also that originality did not stand in such high repute among the ancients as it does at the present day. And it does not lie within the scope of this chapter to call attention

to the other side of the picture. After a chapter on didactic poetry follows one on 'The Crossing or Mixture of Kinds,' in which the bookish character of Alexandrine literature is discussed and its effects upon Latin literature (e.g. the Odes of Horace). In 'Das Gedichtbuch' the author discusses the books of miscellaneous contents which it became the fashion to put together in Hellenistic times; in 'Die Dichtersprache' he treats of the attitude of aristocratic aloofness of the poets ('pingui nil mihi cum populo') and their artificialities of diction, with a great wealth of illustration. The next two chapters deal with the incapacity of the writers of this period to observe, *i.e.* their imperfect touch with the world of nature and historical fact—their 'science and pseudoscience.' Finally, the writers of history are discussed—Curtius, Livy, Tacitus. Here the purpose of the author is to trace the development of

the artistic historical style of Livy and Tacitus out of the bald style of the annalists. To Dr. Kroll Tacitus is the best craftsman; but even he is to some extent hampered by the annalistic tradition.

It will be seen that the severely scientific purpose of this work leaves the author comparatively little opportunity for directing attention to the great qualities of Latin literature. He is concerned with the question how each work came into being—its antecedents and development, rather than the resulting product as a whole. But such studies are a necessary preliminary to discriminating appreciation; and passages are not wanting in which he pays a tribute to the achievements of the greatest of the Romans and to the general superiority of classical Latin literature to the contemporaneous literature of Greece.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

#### THE BUDÉ *ASINARIA*.

*Pseudo-Plaute. Le prix des ânes (Asinaria)*. Texte établi et traduit par LOUIS HAVET et ANDRÉE FRETÉ. (Budé Series.)

HAVET bastardised *Asinaria* on the following grounds: (i.) The Prologue says the play was translated by *Maccus*; (ii.) there is only a single canticum; (iii.) the iambic septenarius is prevalently treated as an asynartete verse; (iv.) there are 'imitations of Plautus'; (v.) there are 'un-Plautine peculiarities'; (vi.) there are anachronisms of fact in the (?) allusion to Isis (806), *oenopolium* (200), *pistor* (*ibid.*), the price of a courtesan, the use of *optio* (101) and *uelitatio* (307); (vii.) the Greek scansion *epistulā* (762); the post-Plautine *disciplina* (201), *obicias* (814); (viii.) the metrical treatment of *quas hodie adullescens* (634).

It would take long to discuss these points in detail; but many of them are anything but irreducible, e.g. for No. viii., why not scan 'quās hōdj'ādūlē-scens'? There is no doubt that the word was pronounced by Plautus very much like the Italian *oggi*. In which case all Havet's somewhat confusing

disquisitions on proceleusmatics (p. lviii) become irrelevant. And on the name *Maccus* it must be objected that the argument fails, since the Prologue (poor scrappy fake that it is) is demonstrated to be late by the neglect of the law against two initial iambs (v. 13 *inēst/lēpōs*). From the Prologue, then, nothing more can be inferred than that the writer, whoever he was—perhaps an archaist of the Antoninian reaction—thought that *Maccus* was Plautus' name, seeing that the plays were entitled *T. Macci Plauti*. But Havet, since *Asinaria* was in the Varronian canon, must find an author before 100 B.C., and suggests Novius or Pomponius.

The constitution of the text will be a surprise to many. Havet, whose rigorous laws have imposed on most of the Budé editors an almost blind adherence to MS. authority, produced an *Asinaria* with the text altered in more than 150 places, and some five-and-twenty lacunae dug and (with Curtian courage and devotion) conjecturally filled up. We gather that after Havet's regretted death the work was

revised by Mlle. Freté and M. L. Nougaret, and we sympathise with the difficulties incident to such a task. But it must be confessed that the text presents a large number of unmetrical verses as well as scansiones that are at best highly questionable. *Graviter* is twice introduced by the editor (254, 555); we have *ego istuc* (38), and *pol istum* (159); *ego hanc* (291); *homō* lengthened (288, 616); *quī amat* for *quī amat* (616); *erūm tu fac* at the opening of v. 476—a most unlikely maintenance of iambic value; *meam . . . partem* (517); *erogila* (326); *tube dare* for *tube dari* (890); *cārendum* (870A); *qu' habet* for *quān habet*—the order of words altered to the detriment of idiom as well as rhythm—(885); 897 is hyper-metric by a mora, 915A short by as much; 908 has a very improbable hiatus.

These lapses are unfortunate in a book which was conceived largely as an object-lesson in *ars critica*; for it contains a *catalogue des fautes* classifying according to the categories of the *Manuel de critique verbale* the errors admitted or supposed to be in the MS. text. 'L'essence des fautes est psychologique et non optique' is a true doctrine, but not popular in all climates—for if that be true, how can they be corrected by machinery?—and one that sometimes needs to be saved from its friends.

One regrets to have to make pretty

large reservations in praising the posthumous work of so illustrious a Latinist as Havet, although his judgment was never adequate to his originality and his learning. But it is a pleasure to add that his translation (if I may judge of it) is excellent, most Plautine in spirit, and—with the few supplementary notes and appendices—really amounting to a commentary on the play, which much needed one. The part of his Introduction that deals with translation is a treasure, especially in the paragraphs about nuances in Latin—the significance of the order of words, the difference between *ego dico* and a plain *dico*, the aspects of the verb in Plautus. Here, too, we need not accept without qualification all the sweeping dogmatic statements (e.g. p. L: '*aedis compilavit* signifie *Il a pillé la maison* [ou *ma, ta, sa maison*], jamais *Il a pillé une maison*'). But I hardly know where in so few pages a student will find so much suggestion. Havet was so steeped in Latin that he could see deep into the colour and texture of a given page of an author where the ordinary textbooks never say a word that teaches us to penetrate the surface. The book is admirably suited for studying and examining in an advanced class round a table. A clever student will change the whole quality of his perceptions and appreciations if he takes in some of Havet's pages.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

#### PROFESSOR REID'S *DE FINIBUS*.

*Cicero, de Finibus*. Books I. and II.  
By J. S. REID, Litt.D. Cambridge,  
1925.

THE appearance of this important work is a notable event in the annals of British scholarship. Its inception goes back to a distant period, since it was already promised some forty years ago when Dr. Reid published his translation 'in advance of the text and commentary.' The delay which has taken place is due to various causes, the chief of which, without doubt, is the extremely ambitious character of the work and the author's desire to obtain final perfection. Also, upon his appointment to the Cambridge Chair of Ancient

History, he judged it proper to concentrate his activities upon subjects immediately connected with his Professorship, such as his elaborate study of the Roman municipalities. A special reason for holding back the publication of the *De Finibus* was that he desired to recollate the MSS. and thus put the coping-stone upon his work. This project was interfered with by the outbreak of the European War, and subsequently his health did not allow him to make the necessary journey. He therefore determined, to the great joy of his friends, to publish his commentary as it stood. Unfortunately his health failed soon afterwards, and he was unable to

see this volume through the Press. At this crisis Dr. Purser, with characteristic generosity, came to his aid and offered to discharge this difficult task. His services are acknowledged in touching words in a note added to the preface by Dr. Reid, who also thanks Mr. A. D. Nock, of Clare College, for valuable help.

Dr. Reid's work has already been termed ambitious. The reason for this statement is that it challenges comparison with that of a very illustrious predecessor, J. N. Madvig. In the preface he says: 'By far the greatest exponent of Ciceronian Latinity who has appeared since the time of Lambinus is J. N. Madvig, whose *magnum opus* was his edition of the *De Finibus*.' Madvig's edition is indeed a classic, and exhibits throughout his unrivalled powers not only as a textual critic, but also as the most acute and subtle of grammarians. Dr. Reid approaches the work of Madvig in a spirit of respect and indeed of reverence; any pronouncement of Madvig is to him a weighty statement, especially when it concerns a fine point of grammar. What, however, he has set himself to do is to probe and reconsider Madvig's views, and in many cases to rectify and modify his conclusions. In subtlety he is not inferior to the great Danish scholar, while his common sense is conspicuous. His illustrations, gathered together in the course of so many years' study, are far more copious than those of his predecessor. He speaks with authority upon philosophical points, and uses sources of information which have come to light since Madvig's time, such as the Herculaneum papyri. On Roman history he is upon ground which he has made his own. His knowledge of Latin literature is complete, and he is nowhere more felicitous than in his comments upon early Latin authors, especially Lucilius.

The first, and also the abiding, impression which his notes make upon the reader, is that of wonderful thoroughness. Many of them are really monographs in themselves, which might be read before a learned society and serve as a basis for an evening's discussion. The information is closely packed, and

no word is superfluous. The longest and most elaborate notes are upon syntax, generally with reference to Madvig's views. There are also important discussions upon points of lexicography. The comments upon philosophical points exhibit minute knowledge brought thoroughly up to date. Literary and historical subjects are treated with the same completeness.

In the *Apparatus Criticus* printed under the text, Dr. Reid does not profess to give more than a selection of readings. This part of his work was no doubt to have been expanded later on when he had been able to make a new collation of the MSS. He has himself made a number of ingenious suggestions on the text of the *De Finibus* as well as upon other works of Cicero, and those of other Latin authors. In *De Finibus* I. 53 ff., where the sense is very difficult to follow, except on the theory of dislocations in the text, he has proposed several transpositions which on various grounds appear to be most attractive. In a note on § 55 he makes a most interesting remark about the pagination of the archetype—viz., that in it a page contained 23 to 24 lines of the Teubner text, and says that there are 'other indications' of this. There is not, however, any other reference to this theory in the present volume.

It cannot be said that the evidence for the text of the *De Finibus* is at all good. Only one MS. (A) goes back so far as the eleventh century, and the later copies are very inferior. Reid, not infrequently, calls attention, and with reason, to the insecurity of the text, when discussing Madvig's views on fine points of grammar. Enthusiastic grammarians should always bear in mind the character of the evidence for the text in question. In I. 10 *cum . . . mihi videor . . . debeo* Madvig and others read *quoniam* for *cum*, Reid retains *cum* and refers to other passages. As a matter of fact, the chief MSS., as will be seen from the critical notes, read *videri*, which may stand for *videar*, as well as for *videor*. As the reading is so uncertain, the passage can hardly be used to establish distinctions between the indicative and the subjunctive.



Though Madvig's armoury was in other respects complete, he lacked one weapon, which is now at the service of scholars. This is furnished by the new science of prose-rhythm, which was necessarily unknown to him. Consequently, when discussing grammatical irregularities, he never asks if the construction was varied on account of the rhythm. Thus Zielinski has drawn attention to his treatment of Cicero in *Cat.* III. 22, where the MSS. give *præsertim qui . . . superârê pôtüerunt*. Here Madvig emends *potuerunt* to *potuerint*, producing a clausula for which there is no parallel elsewhere in Cicero's speeches, in place of the *essê vidëatur* clausula of which he was so fond. Madvig performed a similar feat in *Fin.* II. 12, where after *esse* he reads *voluerint* with a single MS. (B) for *voluerunt*, again producing a clausula for which there is no parallel. A large number of examples might be quoted from the *De Finibus* where subtle interpretations of the great grammarian are at once seen to be unnecessary, since the exigencies of metre supply a simple explanation. Dr. Reid's notes contain a number of references to prose-rhythm as a deciding factor. It is probable that he would have inserted many more, if the bulk of his notes had not been written some years ago.

There are a few points in Dr. Reid's commentary which are not wholly convincing. Thus II. 54, it is hard to suppose that so learned a man as Asconius confused Tubulus with Carbo, and it is to be noticed that the two best transcripts of Asconius, those of Sozomenus and Bartolommeo, give *ut in carcere necaretur*, while the reading *ne* for *ut*, which is essential for Dr. Reid's theory, is only found in that of Poggio, who conjectured freely. In I. 70 the MSS. give *quod et posse fieri intellegimus et sæpe enim videmus*. Here he accepts an emendation of Halm—viz., *evenire* for *enim*—an objection to which is that after a trochee Cicero generally uses a long syllable or two shorts in order to avoid a dactylic

rhythm. In his note he quotes II. 83, *id et fieri posse et sæpe esse factum*, which he says 'refers to this passage.' Surely *factum* (an old correction for *enim*) is here necessary. In II. 94 the MSS. give *Philocteta, si brevis dolor levis*. Madvig emends *si* to *st*, and strikes out *levis*. Reid follows him 'with some hesitation,' pointing out that 'wherever *st*! is given in current texts of Cicero, it is due to conjecture. The Epicurean teaching on the subject of pain is given in § 95—viz., *si gravis, brevis: si longus, levis*. In the present passage we have *si longus, levis*, immediately after *si brevis dolor, levis*. Baiter reads, *Philocteta, si gravis dolor, brevis*, i.e. *brevis* was first replaced by *levis*, and then seized the place of *gravis*.

In one passage a real error seems to have got into the text. This is in II. 56 where the MSS. give:

sic vester sapiens magno aliquo emolumento  
commotus cum causa, si opus erit, dimi-  
cabit.

Most editors consider the words *cum causa* to be corrupt, but Reid defends them. In his critical note the only variant he mentions is *animi causa*, found in inferior MSS. In his text he gives *pecuniae* after *emolumento*, but the word does not appear in other editions, and does not seem to be in any MS. Also, its position in the sentence, after *emolumento*, is odd. It looks as if he had at one time emended *cum* to *pecuniae*—i.e., *pecuniae causa . . . dimicabit*. This would give a good sense, and might be supported from the context where *pecunia* is mentioned. If so, he must have changed his view, without, however, removing *pecuniae* from the text.

The University of Cambridge is to be congratulated upon the publication of this volume, which may with justice be described as a monument of learning. It makes a new contribution to the *Elegantiae Latini sermonis*, and must find a place in the library of every scholar.

ALBERT C. CLARK.



## CICERO'S EPISTULAE AD FAMILIARES.

*M. Tullii Ciceronis Epistulae ad Familiares.* Edidit H. SJÖGREN. Pp. vii + 578. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923-1925.

It would be hard to imagine a work which contained in so restricted a space a greater amount of useful and well-digested learning. Dr. Sjögren of Upsala is widely known as an able grammarian, and as the editor of a critical edition (in progress) of the *Epp. ad Att.* (he has already edited *Q. Fr.* and *ad Brutum*), in which he is developing the line of criticism marked out by Lehmann, and bringing to the work a more minute acquaintance with the MSS. and a wider knowledge of Ciceronian language than that scholar possessed. The editing of the *Epp. ad Fam.* is an easier task; but Dr. Sjögren's learning and judgment have had ample scope to display themselves therein and to make the work a valuable addition to scholarship. The edition is eminently conservative. He holds in a higher degree than recent critics the paramount excellence of M in both halves of the collection, and attributes a lesser degree of importance than it has to GR in I-VIII. and to HD in IX.-XVI., though he considers these to be indispensable at times to the establishment of the text. He is at pains to defend in many places, and with conspicuous success, the tradition of the MSS. against the conjectures of scholars; and it is only in cases which are certain that he will accept conjectures into the text (e.g. 9. 6. 3, Klotz's '*otiosis minabantur*', which is established by *Pro Marc.* 18). He prefers to leave nearly always the unsatisfactory reading of M where no certain restoration has been effected. It is very rarely—and this rarity is to be regretted—that even in the notes a conjecture of his own is hazarded. In 1. 5b. 1 he rightly reads in the text *a. d. VII. Id. Febr.* for VIII., comparing *Q. Fr.* 2. 3. 1 f.; but perhaps there is no need to propose the alteration in 10. 26. 3 of *Ianuarium mensem* into *ensem Ianuarii*, cp. *Sest.* 74.

Examples of cases where good reasons are assigned for retaining the MSS.

tradition are 5. 21. 5 '*praeter culpam ac peccatum qua semper caruisti*', by reference for *qua*, agreeing with the remote antecedent, to *Font.* 12: N. D. 2. 156: comparing the analogous 10. 21. 5 ('*defuturum*'), also 10. 24. 1: 10. 25. 1. Similarly in 14. 7. 2 he shows that *id est Apollini et Aesculapio* is required by '*deus aliquis*' in the preceding clause. In 11. 7. 1 he retains *volam*, quoting (in his *Comm. Tull.*, p. 150) for the use of the future *Plaut. Curc.* 493 '*et quidem meminisse ego haec volam te*,' and *Horace Ep.* I. 14. 44 '*censebo*'), and other examples. An excellent case of retention of the MS. reading is 15. 1. 3 '*quique nostram consuetudinem integritatemque perspexerant*,' where all editors since Ferrarius read *mansuetudinem*. Dr. Sjögren quotes *Caes. B.G.* 4. 22. 1 and better, in *Erano*s XIX. (1919), p. 162, *Vatinius ap. Fam.* 5. 9. 1 '*tuam cons. et liberalitatem*,' and 2 *Verr.* 1. 65 '*humanitatem consuetudinemque*,' which seem to settle the question. We may add *Vitruvius* 2. 8. 12 '*Graecorum cons. et suavitatem*.' He is right in retaining *felicite* in 1. 9. 26 (coll. *ad Brut.* 1. 4a. 3), '*tam Ulixes*' in 1. 10, and in making no addition in 6. 12. 3 '*magno opere putavi . . . perscribi*,' 'ought to be written,' such as *e re* after *opere*, by reference to *Q. Fr.* 2. 15 (14) 3 '*quod putas magis*,' and *Att.* 14. 10. 1 '*me clamare senatum . . . vocari*.' He has convinced me that 6. 5. 1 '*quotiescunque . . . vidi*' is right, and is not to be altered to *video*, by comparing 7. 24. 1 ('*quoquo me verti*'); 13. 41. 1 ('*quotiescunque me vidit*'), and (in *Erano*s, l.c., p. 158) *De Div.* 2. 145 ('*cum . . . viderunt*'). It is doubtful if the balance of probability is in favour of M in 10. 12. 5 '*brevia, fugacia (fugatia M but -ia in an erasure M<sup>8</sup>) caduca*,' the previous words '*speciem gloriae . . . splendoris insignibus*' would seem to support *fucata* of HD, and the adjectives would be less tautologous.

A most valuable feature of the work is the lists of passages illustrating points of grammar—e.g., 2. 17. 6 omission of accusative pronoun when subject to infinitive; 5. 1. 2 imperfect where plu-

perfect might have been expected; 6. 7. 2 changes of mood with no very special variety of meaning; 1. 7. 5 *si* . . . *si* where *si* . . . *sin* might have been expected. Complete knowledge

of modern works on the *Letters* is evident at every turn. He considers that 6. 15 was written 'anno incerto,' and not on the Ides of March 44.

L. C. PURSER.

### CAESAR'S CIVIL WAR.

*The Commentaries of C. Julius Caesar on the Civil War.* By C. E. MOBERLEY, M.A. New illustrated Edition, with an Introduction by HUGH LAST, M.A. Pp. xlviii+227 and 33 maps. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1925. 5s.

THE absence of a preface to this book makes it difficult to determine what modifications have been made in Moberley's original work, and what the exact scope and purpose of the present editor may be. As far as one can judge, no substantial alteration has been made in text or commentary. Mr. Last has written a useful Introduction; and some maps, the source of which is not stated, and several good and interesting illustrations, have been added. It may be worth while to show by a few examples, chosen out of many, how defective in text and commentary Moberley's work is. Bk. I. 4<sup>b</sup> *potentiae*, no note. 5<sup>1</sup> on *docendi Caesaris* M. remarks: 'The reason for the gerundive being the frequent occurrence of two words in connexion with one another, it is obvious that the name of a man can seldom be connected in this degree with any other word.' What does this mean? 5<sup>b</sup> *latorum audacia* retained without note. 7<sup>2</sup> Madvig's *vetaretur* for *notaretur* adopted without comment. 16<sup>1</sup> on *recepto Firmo* M. says: 'The name of Fermo, as Kramer remarks, was introduced as a gloss from Cic. *ad Att.* viii. 10,' but Kramer changed his mind twenty years ago. The text is supported by Dr. Rice Holmes, *The Roman Republic*, III. 363 foll., and by the historian Guglielmo Ferrero. 18<sup>6</sup> *circumvenire* retained, but *circummunire* is necessary. 45<sup>7</sup> *augebatur illis copia* retained without note. 61<sup>4</sup> M. identifies Octogesa with Mequinenza, but Mr. Last (Introduction, p. xxxi) says that it stood on the site of the modern Ribarroja (see Rice Holmes, p. 399 foll.). So as a result of lack of

revision, introduction and commentary contradict one another. 67<sup>4</sup> a corrupt text accepted. 78<sup>1</sup> the correctness of *dierum XXII* is not questioned, but it cannot be right. 80<sup>4</sup> the textual difficulties are disregarded. 85<sup>5</sup> *tot tantasque classes* should have had a note. Bk. II. 6<sup>4</sup> M. commenting on the oddness of ships being said 'to see' anything, adds: 'This mode of expression is probably a consequence of "*magna vis telorum*" which would naturally be in the ablative, being the subject of the preceding sentence.' What this means I cannot imagine. 10<sup>5</sup> *structae trabes* and *conteguntur*, though the MSS. have *structo ut trabes* and *contegitur*: probably *tecto* should be inserted after *structo*. 25<sup>6</sup> M. perversely prints without comment *ad castra Cornelianae vela direxisset*, though the best MSS. S and E have the perfectly correct reading *castra Cornelianae vestra duxisset*=*castra Cornelia naves traduxisset* as H. Meusel discerned! 32<sup>b</sup> *clam vobis* might have had a note. Bk. III. 11<sup>1</sup> *his expositis Corcyrae* a bad text camouflaged by loose translation. 21<sup>b</sup> *familia Neapoli missa* faulty text and no note. 30<sup>1</sup> obscure passage with no note. 49<sup>3</sup> the impossible *ad specus* retained and explained. 67<sup>1</sup> *signo illato* wrongly retained. 81<sup>2</sup> *parerent* and *facerent* making nonsense of the passage: the same error is found in Mr. du Pontet's Oxford text; read of course *pareret, faceret*. 91<sup>3</sup> no note on obvious difficulty. 101<sup>2</sup> *quae sunt ad incendia* no note: the reading of Whl *apta ad* indicates that Caesar may have written *aptae ad*. I have suggested *ad incendia idoneae*, as *idoneus* is a favourite word of Caesar's. 111<sup>3</sup> *illae triremes* no sense: read *quadriremes* with Paul and other editors.

It may be noted that Moberley following General von Göler places the site of the battle of Pharsalia on the

north bank of the Enipeus. Modern investigation supports this view. I believe there has never been any systematic excavation of the supposed site. A battle in which 15,000 men are said to have been killed must have left a large amount of débris on the battlefield, and as the country was thinly populated and there were no tourists in quest of souvenirs much of this must have sunk into the marshy soil. Careful digging might reveal the exact position of the two camps. Will not some young archae-

ologists with time and money to spare undertake the task?

The book closes with a full vocabulary, including some proper names rather indiscriminately chosen. 'Legacy' as a translation of *hereditas* is disquieting to the legal mind.

It is difficult to understand why this book, published in 1888, should have been reproduced in its present form. The commentary is often faulty or insufficient, and the text is inferior to that of any recent edition.

A. G. PESKETT.

### THE BUDÉ VIRGIL.

*Les Bucoliques.* Texte établi et traduit par HENRI GOELZER, Membre de l'Institut, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Paris. Pp. xlii + 81. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres.'

THIS first volume of the Budé Virgil contains introductory chapters on Virgil's life, on the MSS. and the general editions of his works, and on the *Bucolics* in particular. The edition is in no sense eventful, but it gives a sober summary of most Virgilian questions as they stood twenty years ago. The reader will find no new light on the amusing question about the poet's racial origins (Etruscan? Latin? Gaul?). He will perhaps wonder how—for M. Goelzer, who denies all, or virtually all the *Appendix*—Virgil already had a reputation in 43 B.C. A reputation for what? Being unable to speak, and having written nothing?

The 'originality' of the *Bucolics* is well defended; but the criticism (p. 11) of R. Pichon's illuminating remark on Virgil's employment of the characteristically Latin practice of *contaminatio*, seems to imply that M. Goelzer incorrectly conceives the meaning of the term as the blending of two originals, and not the enrichment of a given canvas by borrowed details of colour.

In a new edition of the *Bucolics* we turn naturally to certain spots in order to estimate the new editor's critical discernment.

In l. 69 we find

post aliquot, mea regna uident, mirabor  
aristas

without variant, and for a rendering 'et puis contemplant mes anciens domaines, aurai-je la surprise d'y trouver encore quelques épis?' To which it may be objected that *anciens* is not in the Latin; and that, by making *post* an adverb, you are obliged to supply *uidebo* to the preceding clause, and absurdly divide Meliboeus' re-visit to his farm into two carefully distinguished stages: his boundaries and his cottage, and afterwards a considerable number of corn-ears. Why, when it has been demonstrated that *aristas* can be a refinement on *messes* in the sense of 'summers'?

Again one turns, of course, to *Buc.* IV. 62, and discovers (again with regret) that, in deference to the exploded notion that *rideo* with the accusative implies mockery, whereas in a number of classical passages it means no more than 'to be amused at,' the new editor reprints the illogical reading 'qui non risere parenti': illogical because, though Quintilian's evidence is explicit and decisive for *qui* as against *cui*, the evidence for *parentes* and not *parenti* has all the weight of the Virgil MSS. as against *not* Quintilian but the copyists of Quintilian.

Thirdly, in VI. 24 'satis est potuisse uideri' is rendered 'c'est assez d'avoir pu réussir à me voir.' If, however, he had 'often cheated them both of their hopes of a song,' why should it be so great an event merely to *see* Silenus? They must have *seen* him often enough before, but not, as they do this time, at their mercy because asleep. Still,

Monsieur Goelzer errs in good company; and, of course, it is easy to cavil at the treatment of noted difficulties; as a standard edition for the general reader the book will be wel-

come, and the French translation—if I may venture to judge it—is agreeable. The book is furnished with an *index nominum*.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

#### A RE-READING OF THE BUCOLICS.

*Pastoral and Allegory: A Re-reading of the Bucolics of Virgil.* By J. S. PHILLIMORE. Pp. 32. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2s.

THIS study of the *Eclogues* is a suggestive and often illuminating treatment of a body of poetry which, as Professor Phillimore says, has become, under the searching processes of modern analysis, more and more of a puzzle alike in its origin and its contents. He approaches the complicated enigma with fresh eyes; and he has done well in recalling students of poetry to considerations which lie at the base of its effective study. Of these the first is, what should be obvious enough but what is seldom thought out clearly, the way in which works of art come to be produced. Poetry, ancient or modern, is a single art; when Professor Phillimore mentions what he has himself learned from the study of Keats' beginnings, he is saying something very much to the point. It is in this insistence on the attitude to be taken, the approach to be made, that the value of his 're-reading' primarily lies. Some of his particular conclusions will raise question and may provoke dissent. He finds in the lyrics of the *Acharnians*, with their feeling for 'that old-fashioned, homely, delightful existence to which the refugees pent up in Athens looked back so fondly,' a germ of the pastoral and 'the first authentic ancestors of Theocritus.' More strangely, he finds the model or impulse for Horace's journey to Brundisium in the Theocritean *Thalysia*. Except in the sense in which all literature springs out of the soil of all previous literature, such views seem to verge on paradox. But even less comfortable is his assertion that Virgil in the *Eclogues* 'winks at his audience.' 'This,' he goes on, 'is partly what Horace meant when he spoke of Virgil's humour combined

with tenderness.' This is a large assumption. The word *facetum* has no doubt as many shades of meaning as the English 'wit.' But for what Horace meant, Quintilian's explanation *decoris et excultae cuiusdam elegantiae appellationem* is decisive.

Of special value are the observations on the 'demand on wilful credulity' which all art requires; on *contaminatio*, 'the horror of pedants' but 'the very principle of continuity,' or of contact, 'between age and age in literature'; on the accusation of 'unoriginality' made against Virgil and against Latin poetry in general. The tendency 'to exalt the Greek and abuse the Latin' did nothing but harm to appreciation of both Latin and Greek. It is a fallacy which still lingers and still requires exposure. No less valuable is the stress laid on the fact, clearly established but still imperfectly grasped, that the *Eclogues* are, and were meant to be, the manifesto of a great joint movement of liberation and expansion, representing the reaction from Euphorionism; that they are, in his happy phrase, the Garland of the Circle. Virgil chose to cast them into pastoral form; and that is all there really is in the 'allegory' which they embody. Skutsch, twenty years ago, made this clear as regards VI. and X. The key was in Gallus. The key to the still more enigmatic IV. (could we but find it) is, as Professor Phillimore points out, in Pollio; though we need not follow him so far as to believe that in it Virgil is throughout 'winking at us,' and making fun of Pollio's orientalism and of the Jewish connexion doubtfully ascribed to him. It is highly probable that *Eclogue* IV. has in fact absorbed and transfigured a good deal of Pollio's own *nova carmina*. In the absence of evidence, this is about all that can be said.

J. W. MACKAIL.



## ROMAN BUILDINGS OF THE REPUBLIC.

*Roman Buildings of the Republic.* An attempt to date them from their materials. By TENNEY FRANK. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. III. American Academy in Rome, 1924. \$2.50.

THIS book is of great interest and importance. After insisting in the Introduction upon the difficulty of dating Roman monuments either by stylistic criteria or by the size of the blocks employed, Frank embarks in the first chapter upon a careful analysis of the geological nature of the various materials, and indicates the periods at which each variety was chiefly used. The rest of the book is devoted to a detailed discussion of the monuments, in which he illustrates and justifies his generalisations. It is impossible for anyone not intimately acquainted with the buildings and quarries to criticise his fundamental theses, but his learning and candour are equally obvious. Whether the six sorts of volcanic tufa, difficult to classify by chemical analysis (p. 11), can in fact be distinguished by the eye with absolute confidence, is a question for experts. It is noticeable that Frank remarks (p. 140, n. 5) that a different but analogous problem — whether the stone of the Mummius inscription (*C.I.L.* i<sup>2</sup>, 626) is travertine or ordinary limestone — can only be decided by 'a microscopic analysis by a geologist, which has not yet been made.' It is enough here to point out that almost the whole force of his conclusions rests upon the validity of such distinctions. It is obvious, too, that a book of this sort runs a great risk of circular argument. Indeed, the only check upon this (since little weight is given to stylistic considerations) lies in the literary evidence for the dates of certain buildings, and for the periods when Rome controlled certain quarries. As an example of Frank's method, the

case of travertine may be considered. He believes, from the evidence of certain dateable monuments, that this limestone was not freely used till after the middle of the first century B.C. He is forced to admit its free use at that time in Plancus' restoration of the Temple of Saturn (42 B.C.), but he remarks that 'even Augustus' builders employ it more sparingly' (p. 54), and it would seem that but for this one piece of evidence he would scarcely admit such lavish use of it before the Flavian age. Yet he confidently denies (p. 127) that the travertine-built southern temple in the Forum Holitorium, which Delbrück, on stylistic grounds, assigned to the third century B.C., can even be so early as the Sullan age, to which Huelsen, for reasons like his own, had been constrained to lower it, and attributes it (partly, indeed, on literary evidence) to a conservative restoration in 31 B.C. As travertine was certainly used, though sparingly, before the end of the second century, Frank's confidence seems exaggerated. Again, the argument (p. 140) that 'no inscription on travertine can clearly be shown to be earlier than 130 B.C.' hardly justifies the conclusion that a certain arch of the Ponte Rotto cannot be as old as 142 B.C. It is enough to compare the case of marble, which was used architecturally in 78 B.C., if not, as Velleius states, seventy years earlier, yet does not appear as a material for inscriptions before the death of Julius Caesar (p. 34).

But whatever doubts may be felt as to the finality of all Frank's conclusions (and he is far from claiming finality), very many of them are convincing. It is impossible here to attempt to describe his particular results, but it is clear that the combination of work like this with the intensive study of style has already begun to dispel the darkness which enshrouds Roman architectural chronology.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

*The Relation of Dogmatism and Scepticism in the Philosophical Treatises of Cicero.* By MARGARET YOUNG HENRY. Pp. viii + 117. Geneva, N.Y.: Humphrey, 1925.

THIS doctoral dissertation summarises in succession the main argument of each of Cicero's

philosophical works, with a view to determining the positive elements in his thought. The author does not succeed in formulating, so far as we can see, any fragments of genuine philosophical speculation, though she claims at intervals affinities to the more popular writings

of William James. The problem of sources and method of composition is not directly faced at all; and the whole question of Cicero's originality really depends upon this. For not even Cicero's greatest admirers have hailed him as an original *thinker*. The only question that can be raised is whether and how far in these treatises he is an original *writer*, and not a mere translator or paraphrast of a foreign original. No mere exposition of the subject-matter of the treatises will go any way to answer this question. Within its rather narrow limits, however, Miss Henry's work is carefully done, and shows evidence of genuine interest in the writings expounded.

J. L. STOCKS.

account of the various burial rites, inhumation and cremation, in the last chapter. In this connexion, both these writers handicap themselves needlessly by an 'illicit conversion' unfortunately common among archaeologists—namely, that because cases can be quoted in which one race practises cremation and another inhumation, therefore whenever we find inhumation and cremation side by side we must suppose that two races are to be distinguished: a false doctrine which particularly confuses Miss Holland's work. However, both she and Mr. Bryan honestly give the facts, whether they can explain them or not, and therefore the reader can apply such remedies as seem fit.

H. J. ROSE.

*Italic Hut Urns and Hut Cemeteries: A Study in the Early Iron Age of Latium and Etruria.* By W. R. BRYAN. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. IV.) Pp. xiv+204. 25 illustrations in 7 plates. Rome: Sindicato italiano Arti grafiche (for the American Academy), 1925.

*The Faliscans in Prehistoric Times.* By LOUISE ADAMS HOLLAND. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. V.) Pp. viii+162. 13 plates. Rome: Sindicato italiano Arti grafiche (for the American Academy), 1925.

THE American Academy goes steadily and rapidly on, gathering facts concerning early Italy, docketing them neatly, and adding a certain amount of theory and deduction, for which chapter and verse is conscientiously given. The resulting books are for the specialist in archaeology, rather than for the classical student in general, but they are materials which the specialist will use and welcome, and everyone interested in Italian history and religion will need to refer to them now and again.

Mr. Bryan seems at first sight to depart from the usual arrangement of this series, which is geographical; but he explains (p. 5) that in Italy, whatever may be the case elsewhere, the hut urn is confined within quite narrow limits, none having ever been found outside of Etruria and Northern Latium. Chronologically, it belongs to the so-called Italic civilisation of the eighth and ninth centuries B.C., and vanishes under the increasing pressure of Umbrian and Etruscan influence. His book, therefore, is in some sort an archaeological history of those centuries in part of Central Italy, with particular reference, as must needs be the case when all the material is from graves, to funeral rites.

Miss Holland confines herself to the Faliscan territory, and puts together, a little dryly, all that archaeology can so far tell us of the somewhat backward people inhabiting that region in pre-classical ages. They were, it seems, a Stone-Age folk of nowise peculiar culture, afterwards invaded by the Iron-Age, 'Italic' race; the Bronze Age seems to have left them untouched, so far as invasions were concerned. As points of interest in this book may be mentioned the light it throws on the early history of horsemanship in Italy (p. 125 ff.), as deduced from certain of the remains, and the

*Die italischen Hüttenurnen.* By Dr. JOHANNES SUNDWALL. (*Acta Academiae Aboensis Humaniora*, IV.) Pp. 78. 3 full-page illustrations. Åbo, 1925.

THIS modest little brochure is not made superfluous by the larger work of Mr. Bryan, reviewed above; rather do they supplement one another. Dr. Sundwall gives a list of all the published hut urns known to him; collation of a few passages with Mr. Bryan's list shows certain differences, real or apparent, and suggests that the adoption of some uniform system of numbering these and other objects is highly desirable. He then has, what Mr. Bryan has not, a collective discussion of the typology of the urns. Both works deal, although in a different manner, with the influence of the hut urn on other types of ossuary. For the ethnological and historical conclusions to be drawn from these monuments, Mr. Bryan's work must be consulted, as Dr. Sundwall does not discuss them.

H. J. ROSE.

*Nicolaus of Damascus' Life of Augustus.*

By CLAYTON MORRIS HALL, Ph.D. Pp. 97. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College Classical Studies, No. 4, 1923.

THE fragments of the *Bios Kaisaros* which are preserved, 31 chapters in all, fall into three sections, 1-18 narrating in some detail the earliest years of Augustus, 19-27 an account of the events from March 15 to November 44, and 28-31 the actions of Octavian from his return to Italy until the same date. The first section contains little of historical importance, but the second and third, written as they were by one whose friendship with Augustus gave him exceptional sources of information, contain much that is useful in checking statements in Cicero and the other sources, and some information not otherwise recorded.

Students of the period will accordingly welcome the present brochure, which contains the Greek text of Dindorf (with a few changes), a translation, and notes, which last are particularly useful for the full citation of parallels from the other sources.

It rarely happens that a translator succeeds in producing a version at once easy to read and reliable in its rendering of difficult passages. Nicolaus' bald and pedestrian style does little

to help the translator to the first, and Dr. Hall has concentrated his efforts in securing the second desideratum. In a few cases a desire for definition has perhaps carried him away from correctness—e.g., cap. 19 fin., 'before he had a chance to read it,' where the Greek has simply *πρὶν ἀναγνῶναι*; and there is an odd mistake in cap. 20, where translation and notes have Cyrus, but the Greek *Καυράπλωα*.

But such faults are rare, and many students will be glad to save themselves trouble by an occasional glance at the right-hand page, while the too large class of Greekless historians may be congratulated on the fact that an indispensable document is here presented to them in a reliable form.

D. ATKINSON.

*Papyrusbriefe aus der frühesten Römerzeit:* Inaugural Dissertation. Von BROR OLSSON, Pp. xii+240. Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri-A.-B., 1925.

ALIKE for their human interest and for the help they give to students of colloquial Greek, the history of the language and its pronunciation, the private letters are perhaps the most valuable of all the various classes of papyri which have been recovered from the soil of Egypt. The present volume is a welcome addition to the literature dealing with them, and will take its place along with Witkowski's corpus of letters of the Ptolemaic period, and with Ghedini's of early Christian letters, as a handy collection of texts and a mine of linguistic material. Dr. Olsson confines himself to the period between 30 B.C. and A.D. 100—a rather arbitrary space of time, at least as regards the lower limit, but since letters of the Roman period are numerous, it was doubtless necessary to restrict the selection in some way. The editorial work is excellently done; the editor has not usually had the opportunity of seeing the papyri themselves, but he has in many cases consulted scholars who had, and in this way has been enabled to check his conjectures for the improvement of the texts. There are, in fact, a fair number of new readings, so that the volume is an indispensable work of reference for the letters of the early Roman period. Moreover, the editor has advanced explanations of many difficult or obscure words, not all of them acceptable, but all deserving of attention and not a few of them convincing. He translates the texts and adds an elaborate commentary, in which students will find much valuable material. A brief introduction, in which he discusses epistolary formulae, and indexes add to the value of his

volume, on which he is to be warmly congratulated.

H. I. BELL.

*Conlectanea Epigraphica* (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift, 1923, IV.). By HARRY ARMINI. Pp. 58. Göteborg: Wettergren and Kerber, 1923. 3 kronor.

*Epigraphica Latina Africana.* De titulis sepulcralibus prosa oratione compositis provinciarum Byzacenae et Proconsularis quaestiones selectae. By GUNNAR SÖDERSTRÖM. Pp. xi+121. Upsala: Appelbergs Boktryckeri A.-B., 1924.

SWEDISH scholars are much attracted by the philological side of epigraphy, which is of importance for the study of the development of vulgar Latin. Armini's miscellany has a rather wider scope, but the bulk of it deals with matters of a linguistic rather than of an historical character. He begins with three unpublished inscriptions brought from Rome to Gothenburg by Professor Lundström, which have no very great interest, and proceeds to offer restorations and explanations of a variety of Latin inscriptions—almost all sepulchral and chiefly metrical, together with a few Christian texts—and of epitaphs from the Jewish catacombs of Rome, mostly in Greek, and mostly published by Paribeni in *Notizie degli Scavi*. The restorations and observations are ingenious and reasonable.

Söderström's dissertation is a study of certain formulae and phrases used in epitaphs of the provinces Byzacena and Proconsularis. It deals (1) with the variations of the formulae employed to indicate the age of the deceased and with related points; and (2) with terms of family relationship and other appellatives, and the epithets applied to them. The chief conclusions that emerge under (1) are that *vixit annis . . . mensibus . . . diebus* is much commoner than *vixit annos . . . menses . . . dies*; that the former is more frequent than *vixit annis . . . menses . . . dies*, and that the case of the months and days is always the same. In Christian inscriptions *vixit annis* continues to prevail, but the months and days are oftener in the accusative than in the ablative. Under (2) is discussed, among other matters, the interpretation of epithets such as *carissimus* ('loving' and 'loved'), *pius* (often 'loving'), *amantissimus* (frequently in passive sense), *acerbissimus* ('ganz unreif,' and also 'cruel'), and of phrases like *vixit pietatem* (for *pie* or *pious*). The dissertation ends with a discussion of six inscriptions which are 'carminum similes propter epithetorum naturam et formulas ex carminibus receptas.'

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

#### CAMBRIDGE PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

ON January 29, 1925, Professor J. Whatmough submitted the text of twelve new Messapic inscriptions, and discussed the interpretation of these and of one earlier known, as also Messapic inscriptions in general (*Cambridge University Reporter*, March 10, 1925; *Proceedings*, pp. 1 ff.).

On February 12, 1925, Mr. J. M. Edmonds

read 'Some Notes on the *Persae* of Timotheus' (*C.U.R.*, February 17, 1925; printed in full in *Proceedings*, pp. 4 ff.).

On February 26, 1925, Sir William Ridgeway read 'Euripides in Macedon' (*C.U.R.*, April 21, 1925; *Proc.*, p. 17; printed in full in *C.Q.*, 1926, pp. 1 ff.).

Mr. J. R. Wardale read 'An Emendation of

Lucretius,' supporting Voss's *amusi* in I. 657 (*C.U.R.*, *l.c.*; *Proc.*, pp. 17 f.).

On May 7, 1925, Mr. E. Harrison read 'The Birth of Euripides,' arguing that the poet's name is connected with Euripos, and that his birth is to be placed at the time when interest was concentrated on the Euripos in 480 B.C. (*C.U.R.*, June 9, 1925; *Proc.*, pp. 18 f.).

Mr. H. Mattingly read 'Coinage and Currency in Livy' (*C.U.R.*, *l.c.*; printed in full in *Proc.*, pp. 19 ff.).

On October 29, 1925, Dr. J. A. Nairn read 'The Humorous Element in Greek Tragedy' (*C.U.R.*, November 24, 1925; *Proc.*, pp. 24 ff.).

Sir William Ridgeway read 'The Romano-Campanian Coins with Head of Mars (*obv.*) and a Horse's Head (*rev.*),' arguing for Mommsen's dating of them and against Mattingly's view (*C.U.R.*, *l.c.*; *Proc.*, pp. 26 ff.).

On November 26, 1925, Professor A. C. Pearson read notes on the *Philoctetes* of Sophocles (*C.U.R.*, December 15, 1925; *Proc.*, p. 29; printed in full in *C.R.*, 1926, pp. 58 ff.); and on Arist. *Ach.* 399, explaining ἀναβάδην as a reference to poetical inspiration lifting the poet to the upper air (*C.U.R.*, *l.c.*; *Proc.*, *l.c.*).

Mr. E. Harrison drew attention to passages of Euripides asserting that a child was named by its father or by its mother, not by both, and invited illustration (*C.U.R.*, *l.c.*; *Proc.*, *l.c.*).

Mr. D. S. Robertson proposed in Propertius II. xiii. 47 *longa suae minuisse, 48 garrulus Iliacis*; and in Ovid, *Tristia* I. v. 61 f. *trans freta sideribus totis distantia mensis | me tulit in Geticos Sarmaticosque sinus* (*C.U.R.*, *l.c.*; *Proc.*, *l.c.*).

On January 21, 1926, Professor R. S. Conway read a note on Livy XXI. 31. 4, in which he suggested that the tributary of the Rhone was the Sorgue, and that *Sorga* or *Sorgas* should be read for *Savar*, the original reading of M. He

read also a note on 'The Patrician Mark on Latin Grammar.' Mr. E. Harrison read a note on the Greek inscription at Abu-Simbel suggesting that ΗΕΑΕΘΟΞΟΥΔΑΜΟΥ means 'Axe the son of Nobody' (*C.U.R.*, January 26, 1926).

On February 11, 1926, Professor F. E. Adcock read a paper on 'The Athenian Forces in the Egyptian Expedition,' supporting the view that 40 or 50 triremes, not 200, were lost in 454 B.C. Mr. R. Hackforth read notes on Juvenal: III. 86-108 (the aspect of the Greek indicated in 86 is the subject of the whole passage); III. 129 (*dudum uigilantibus orbis* is an oblique ablative absolute); VIII. 192; VIII. 241 (read *dux for in*); XI. 57 (read *iuxta sermonibus*). (*C.U.R.*, February 23, 1926.)

On March 4, 1926, Professor H. J. Rose read a paper on 'The Folklore of Saint Augustine' (*C.U.R.*, March 18, 1926, to be printed in full in *Proceedings*, 1926).

On May 6, 1926, Professor A. E. Housman read notes on Fronto, *ad M. Caes.* III. 12 (p. 49 Naber) (*dicere < tantum docere > s: at tu simul*); *ib.* 13 (p. 51) (*ratio for oratio*, perhaps also *amandi for amantibus*); *ad M. Ant. imp.* I. 5 (p. 102) (*amasti for amas*); *ad L. Ver. imp.* I. 1 (p. 115) *an tu < censes Epictetum > consulto uerbis usum < sordidis >* and *tam facile ille < pedum incolumitatem quam eloquentiam potuit comparare >*; *de orationibus* (p. 158) (*septimum for septima*); (*ad amic.* I. 1 (p. 173) (*sed or nam for nec*); *ib.* (p. 174) (*solicitudo animi me a < rces > multis eum uerbis commendare*; *sed fidum amorem nostri spondet < spes subuenturum et, quid > quid postule*). Mr. D. S. Robertson read notes on *H. Hom.* XXXIV. 16 (*ἀπορόν σφισιν for πρόνον σφισιν*); Menand. *Epitr.* 304 (insert ON. *εἶς* before *εὐδύς*); Apul. *Met.* III. 29 (interpret *Iuppiter ille* of the Emperor). Mr. A. D. Nock read a note on 'The end of the Rhesus' (*C.U.R.*, May 18, 1926).

## OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE following papers were read:

May 14, 'Greek Notions of Natural Law,' by Professor J. L. Myres.

May 21, 'An Attempted Diagnosis of the

Archer's Bow of the Homeric Poems,' by Mr. H. Balfour.

June 4, 'The Augustan and Post-Augustan Legions,' by Mr. H. M. D. Parker.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK). (1926.)

GRAMMAR, ETC.—May 24. E. A. Sonnenschein, *What is Rhythm?* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1925] (G. Lodge). Long, careful and sympathetic review.—J. P. Postgate, *Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* [Liverpool University Press, 1924] (G. M. Bolling). B. writes a polemic against the printing of Greek accents.

HISTORY.—May 10. E. S. McCartney, *Warfare by Land and Sea* [Boston: Marshall Jones, 1923—in 'Our Debt to Greece and Rome'] (W. A. Oldfather). Praised. O. criticises certain details.—A. J. Toynbee, *Greek Historical Thought from Homer to the Age of Heraclitus* [London: Dent, 1924—in 'The Library of Greek Thought'] (W. K. Prentice). Translation of select passages, with introduction. The choice of selections is admirable, but there is little coherence,



and T. draws no conclusions as to the standards and soundness of Greek historical thought.—May 17. A. J. Toynbee, *Greek Civilisation and Character* [London: Dent, 1924—in same series] (I. M. Linforth). L. regrets the limitation which confines the selections to historians only. 'T. has made a valiant attempt to create a worthy thing where the conditions were all against him.'—M. Croiset, *Hellenic Civilisation: an Historical Survey* (trans. by P. B. Thomas) [New York: Knopf, 1925] (L. R. Shero). The book is highly praised: the translation is not.—May 24. J. Hammer, *Prolegomena to an Edition of the 'Panegyricus Messalae': the Military and Political Career of M. Valerius Messala Corvinus* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1925] (A. E. R. Boak). A doctorate dissertation: 'an excellent piece of biographical research.'

LITERATURE.—April 26. V. Bérard, *L'Odyssée: Texte Établi et Traduit: Tomes I.-III.* V. Bérard, *Introduction à l'Odyssée: Tomes I.-III.* [Paris: Association G. Budé, 1924-5] (A. Shewan). The last word in dissection of the *Odyssey*; long and minute review, unfavourable.—May 10. H. Weir Smyth, *Aeschylean Tragedy* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1924] (C. W. Peppeler). The Sather lectures for 1923; highly praised. RELIGION.—May 3. Grace H. Macurdy, *Troy and Paonia; with Glimpses of Ancient Balkan History and Religion* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1925] (S. E. Bassett). Partly a rewriting of articles already published. Original and stimulating, but not too reliable.

MUSÉE BELGE. BULLETIN BIBLIOGRAPHIQUE ET PÉDAGOGIQUE. XXX. Nos. 4-6 (APRIL, 1926).

P. Faider, *Sénèque et Saint Paul*. Traces history of legend of influence and correspondence. H. Glaesener, *Une reminiscence classique chez Alfred de Vigny*. J. Gessler, *Un soldat de Xénophon à l'éternel (Anab. III. 2-9) Commentaire folklorique*.

GREEK.—Aristotle: M. Defourny, A.: *L'Évolution sociale*, Louvain, 1924. Valuable (F. Collard). Plato: L. Robin, *Phédon*, Collection Budé. 20 fr. Most complete and rigorous edition yet published: masterly study (Anon.). J. Crexells, *Dial. I. and II.*, Barcelona, Edit. Catalana, 1924-5. Favourable (A.D.). Pythagoras: M. Meunier, *Les Vers d'Or: Hierocles, Commentaire, trad., prolég. et notes*, Paris L'Artisan du Livre, 15 fr. Favourable (Anon.).

LATIN.—Augustine: P. de Labriolle, *Saint A. Confessions tome I.*, Coll<sup>le</sup> Budé, 1925. The perfect interpreter (G. Hinisdaels). Ovid: H. Bornecque, *L'Art d'Aimer*, Budé, 1924. Favourable (J. Hubaux). Plautus: L. Havet et A. Freté, *Pseudo-Plaute, Le Prix des Anes*, Budé, 1925, 15 fr. J. Hubaux doubts date assigned. J. P. Waltzing, *Captivi, Texte revu*, and *Traduction littérale*, Cham-

pion, 1926, 7'50 fr. each. Favourable (P. Faider). *Sallust*: B. Ornstein and J. Roman, *Cat. Jug.*, Budé, 1924. Favourable (P. Faider). *Seneca*: A. Bourguery, *Dial. II.*, Budé, 1923. Favourable (P. Faider). R. Waltz, *Dial. III., Consolations*, Budé. Has not minutely revised Gertz; but some happy conjectures (P. Faider). C. Cardo, *Opera I. (de Ira) and II.*, Ed. Catalan, 1924. Favourable (A.D.). *Virgil*: H. Goelzer, *Bucoliques*, Budé, 1925. Might have had a more important volume in the Collection (J. Hubaux). H. E. Butler, *Aeneid VI.*, Blackwell, 1920. Favourable (V. Larock).

GENERAL.—A. Meillet et J. Vendryès, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*. Champion, 1924. Favourable (J. Mansion). W. Theiler, *Zur Geschichte der teleologischen Naturbetrachtung bis auf Aristoteles*, Zürich, Hoenn, 1925. Interesting (A. Clausse). O. Navarre, *Le théâtre grec: l'édifice, l'organisation matérielle, les représentations*, Payot, 1925, 12 fr. Favourable (Cam. Bottin). S. Reinach, *La représentation du galop dans l'art ancien et moderne*, Leroux, 1925, 15 fr. Favourable (P. d'Hérouville). L. Bréhier, *L'Art byzantin*, Laurens, 12 fr. A fine synthesis (A. Fliche). Petits Précis Dalloz, *Droit romain avec une préface de P. Collinet et A. Giffard*, Paris, Dalloz, 1926, 12 fr. Will be of great service (J. Willems).

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(FEBRUARY—APRIL, 1926.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—F. Taeger, *Thukydides* [Stuttgart, 1925, Kohlhammer. Pp. viii + 309. 12 M.] (Rossbach). Politics and history clearly described; sketch of Thucydides belongs to the best that has been written about him.—*Eschyle. Tome II.: Agamemnon, Les Choéphores, Les Euménides*. Texte établi et traduit par P. Mazon [Paris, 1925. Pp. 171] (Wecklein). Does not do his subject justice either in accuracy or in knowledge of pertinent literature.—*Herodas*. After notices of editions by Knox, Groeneboom and Terzaghi, reviewer (R. Herzog) discusses at considerable length advances in text and commentary and adds suggestions.—*L'empereur Julien, Oeuvres complètes. Tome I. 2: Lettres et fragments*. Texte revu et traduit par J. Bidez [Paris, 1924, Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres'. Pp. xxiv + 258. 20 F.] (Ammon.). Explanatory introductions, full and reliable critical apparatus, translation close and tasteful, indices and get-up very good.—A. M. Harmon, *Lucian, with an English translation. Vol. IV.* [London, 1925, Heinemann. Pp. 422] (Helm). Reviewer regrets that the general plan has not made a really scientific edition possible. H. is thoroughly qualified for his task.—P. Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie* [Berlin, 1925, Weidmann. Pp. 86] (Wüst). G. is familiar with all the recent literature. Reviewer hopes that this fruitful work will stimulate further research.

**LATIN LITERATURE.**—C. H. Beeson, *A Primer of Medieval Latin. An Anthology of Prose and Poetry* [Chicago, 1925, Scott, Foresman and Co. Pp. 389] (Manitius). Very suitable as an introduction to Medieval Latin; plentiful extracts over wide range, with short notes and vocabulary.—K. Polheim, *Die lateinische Reimprosa* [Berlin, 1925, Weidmann. Pp. xx + 539. 27 M.] (Manitius). Definitive scientific account based on vast collection of material; deserves warmest thanks of classical philologists, historians, and theologians.

**HISTORY AND LAW.**—E. Meyer, *Blüte und Niedergang des Hellenismus in Asien. Kunst und Altertum, Bd. V.* [Berlin, 1925. Pp. 82] (Berve). Traces history of Hellenism east of Euphrates; clear and unbiased, and astonishingly full of facts and historical combinations.—T. Birt, *Alexander der Grosse und das Weltgriechentum bis zum Erscheinen Jesu* [Leipzig, 1924, Quelle u. Meyer. Pp. 497. 12 plates] (Wagner). Fascinating account, but at times needlessly colloquial; written for modern public, and no means left untried of familiarising ancient conditions. A second edition has already appeared with additions and corrections.—L. Wenger, *Institutionen des römischen Zivilprozessrechts* [München, 1925, Verlag der Hochschulbuchhandlung. Pp. xi + 355] (Kübler). W. is master of his material throughout, and clear and elegant in expression; his work is its own recommendation.—M. Wlassak, *Die klassische Prozessformel, mit Beiträgen zur Kenntnis des Juristenberufes in der klassischen Zeit. Teil I. Sitzb. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Wien Bd. 202, 3* [Wien, 1924, Holder-Pichler-Tempsky. Pp. 249] (Kübler). Rich in matter and ideas; like all of W.'s writings, characterised by exemplary accuracy, constant reference to sources, and clearness of exposition. Second part eagerly awaited.

**PHILOSOPHY AND MYTHOLOGY.**—G. Méautis, *Aspects ignorés de la religion grecque* [Paris, 1925, De Boccard. Pp. 169. 7.50 F.] (Howald). This brilliantly written book contains chapters on musical aspect of religion (with references to Plato), hero-worship, Socrates. Warmly recommended.—U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Die griechische Heldensage. Sitzb. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.* [Berlin, 1925. Pp. 21 and 28] (Pfister). Part I. deals with sources, Part II. examines typical examples. Reviewer discusses at some length.

**ARCHAEOLOGY AND TRAVEL.**—K. Hielscher, *Italien. Über 300 Abbildungen in Kupfertiefdruck* [Berlin, 1925, Wasmuth. 24 M.] (Philipp). Skilful selection of artistic views. Introduction by W. von Bode.—A. Philippson, *Das fernste Italien* [Leipzig, 1925, Akad. Verlagsgesellschaft. With 7 plates and 3 plans. 6.30 M.] (Philipp). Deals with towns of Magna Graecia; both scientific and practical as a guide, and contains valuable geological descriptions of sites.—Lillian M. Wilson, *The Roman Toga* [Baltimore, 1924, The Johns Hopkins Press. Pp. 132 with 75 illustrations] (Bieber). Most valuable and important results; a great advance on all her predecessors in this field.—W. H. Schuchhardt, *Die Meister des grossen Frieses von Pergamon* [Berlin, 1925, de Gruyter. Pp. 74 with 21 illustrations and 34 plates. 40 M.] (P. Herrmann). S.'s object is to assign the various parts of the frieze to their respective sculptors; notable results which will stimulate further research.

**PAPYROLOGY.**—*Papyri Osloenses. Fasc. I. Magical Papyri.* Edited by S. Eitrem [Oslo, 1925, Dybwad. Pp. 151 with 13 plates] (Preisendanz). Acute and discriminating commentary together with translation greatly assists understanding of texts.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.*

*\*.\* Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

Allen (P. S. and H. M.) *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami denuo recognitum et auctum. Tom. VI.: 1525-1527.* Pp. xxv + 518. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 28s. net.

Appleton (R. B.) *Nocturnus. Dramatic Dialogues.* Pp. 56. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 1s. 9d. net.

Barry (M. F.) *The Vocabulary of the Moral-ascetical Works of Saint Ambrose: A Study in Latin Lexicography.* Pp. xiii + 287. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. X.) Brookland, D.C.: The Catholic Education Press, 1926. Paper, 92.

Baynes (N. H.) *The Historia Augusta: Its Date and Purpose.* Pp. 150. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Berve (H.) *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage. I.: Darstellung;*

II.: Prosopographie. Pp. xv + 357, 446. Munich: Beck, 1926. Paper, 45 M.

Bickermann (E.) *Das Edikt des Kaisers Caracalla in P. Giss. 40. Inaugural dissertation.* Pp. 39.

Bräuninger (F.) *Untersuchungen zu den Schriften des Hermes Trismegistus. Inaugural dissertation.* Pp. 42. Berlin, 1926. Paper.

Bruck (E. F.) *Totenteil und Seelgerät im griechischen Recht.* Pp. xxiv + 374. (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung u. antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 9. Heft.) Munich: Beck, 1926. Paper, 22 M.

*Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé.* No. 11. Avril, 1926.

*Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé.* No. 12. Juillet, 1926.

- Carlsson (G.)** Die Ueberlieferung der Seneca-Tragödien. Eine textkritische Untersuchung. Pp. 80. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1, Bd. 21, Nr. 5.) Lund: Gleerup (Leipzig: Harrassowitz), 1926. Paper, 2 kr. 50 öre.
- Casson (S.)** Macedonia, Thrace, and Illyria: Their Relations to Greece from the Earliest Times down to the Time of Philip, Son of Amyntas. Pp. xxi+357: 106 illustrations, 19 maps. Oxford: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Childe (V. G.)** The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origins. Pp. xv+221: 21 illustrations, 8 plates. (The History of Civilization.) London: Kegan Paul, 1926. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Classical Philology.** Vol. XXI, No. 2. April, 1926.
- Denniston (J. D.)** M. Tulli Ciceronis in M. Antonium Orationes Philippicae Prima et Secunda. Edited, with introduction, notes (mainly historical), and appendices, by J. D. D. Pp. xxiv+186. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Dessau (H.)** Geschichte der römischen Kaiserzeit. 2. Band, 1. Abt. Die Kaiser von Tiberius bis Vitellius. Pp. viii+400. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 14 M.
- Dickinson (F. W. A.)** The Use of the Optative in the Works of St. John Chrysostom. Pp. xvi+181. (The Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. XI.) Brookland, D.C., U.S.A.: The Catholic Education Press, 1926. Paper, \$2.
- Diehl (E.)** Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres. Vol. II., fasc. 3. Pp. 161-240. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 3.75 M.
- D'Ooge (M. L.)** Nicomachus of Gerasa: Introduction to Arithmetic. Translated into English by M. L. D'O., with studies in Greek arithmetic by F. E. Robbins and L. C. Karpinski. Pp. 318. (University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. XVI.) New York: The Macmillan Company, 1926. Cloth.
- Freeman (K.)** The Work and Life of Solon. With a translation of his poems. Pp. 236. Cardiff: University of Wales Press Board (London: Milford), 1926. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Friedrichsen (G. W. S.)** The Gothic Version of the Gospels: A Study of its Style and Textual History. Pp. 263. Oxford: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Giglioli (I.)** La poesia properziana. Pp. 32. (Estratto dall' *Atene e Roma*.) Florence: Vallecchi. Paper.
- Giles (Brother).** Latin and Greek in College Entrance and College Graduation Requirements. Pp. xiii+190. Brookland, D.C., U.S.A.: The Catholic Education Press, 1926. Paper, \$2.50.
- Goebel (W.)** Quaestiones rhythmicæ imprimis ad Theodoretum Historiam Ecclesiasticam pertinentes. Pp. xi+85. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 4.50 M.
- Haines (C. R.)** Sappho: The Poems and Fragments. Greek text with an English translation by C. R. H. Pp. xvi+255; 20 plates. (Broadway Translations.) London: Routledge, 1926. Quarter-vellum, 12s. 6d. net.
- Harland (J. P.)** Prehistoric Aigina: A History of the Island in the Bronze Age. Pp. xii+121. Paris: Champion, 1925. Paper.
- Heikel (I. A.)** Quaestiones criticae de nonnullis scriptorum Graecorum locis. Pp. 14. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum I. 7.) Helsingfors: Helsingfors Centraltryckeri, 1926. Paper.
- Hudson-Williams (T.)** Early Greek Elegy: The Elegiac Fragments of Callinus, Archilochus, Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, Xenophanes, and others. Edited with introduction, text, critical notes, and commentary. Pp. 132. Cardiff: The University of Wales Press Board (London: Milford), 1926. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Janson (E.)** P. Ovidii Nasonis Fasti. Relegit et suecice convertit E. J. Libri I., II., III. Pp. 45, 51, 51. Göteborg: Wettergren and Kerber, 1924-5-6. Paper, each book 2 kr.
- Johnstone (K.)** The Hippolytus of Euripides translated into English Verse. Pp. 59. Published by Philip Mason for the Balliol Players. Paper, 2s. net.
- Klots (A.)** C. Iulius Caesar. Edidit A. K. II.: De Bello Civili. Editio maior. Pp. xiv+184. (Bibliotheca Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1926. Paper, G.-M. 2.60 (bound, G.-M. 4.20).
- Liddell and Scott.** A Greek-English Lexicon. A new edition. Part 2: ἀποβάλλω—διαιτέω. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Macnaghten (H.)** The Antigone of Sophocles. Translated by H. M. Pp. xxvi+45. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Paper, 2s. net.
- Marc-Aurèle.** A moi-même. Traduit du grec en français. Pp. 327. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1926. Paper, 15 frs.
- Mey (O.)** Das Schlachtfeld vor Troja. Pp. 37; photographs, maps, etc. Berlin and Leipzig: De Gruyter, 1926. Paper.
- Mierow (H. E.)** The Roman Provincial Governor as he appears in the Digest and Code of Justinian. Pp. 54. (Colorado College Publication. General Series. No. 140. Language Series, Vol. III., No. 1.) Colorado Springs, July, 1926. Paper.
- Milne (C. H.)** A Reconstruction of the Old Latin Text or Texts of the Gospels used by Saint Augustine. Pp. xxviii+177. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Mössel (E.)** Die Proportion in Antike und Mittelalter. Pp. 128; 63 illustrations. Munich: Beck, 1926. Paper, 9 M.
- Μουσείο.** Rivista di Antichità. Anno III., Fascicolo I. 1926.
- Müller (P. A.)** Oratio quae inter Lysiacas fertur octava. Recensuit et explicavit P. A. M. Pp. 111. Münster, 1926. Paper.
- Nairn (J. A.)** Latin Prose Composition. Library edition with versions. Pp. xi+168+52. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

- Nauck (C.)** Des Q. Horatius Flaccus sämtliche Werke. Erster Teil. Oden und Epoden. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von C. N. Neunzehnte Auflage von P. Hoppe. Pp. xxii+218. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1926. Cloth, R.-M. 5.
- Odelstierna (I.)** De vi futurali ac finali gerundii et gerundivi latini observationes. Accedunt de verbo imputandi adnotationes. Commentatio academica. Pp. vii+84. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1926. Paper.
- Oomen (G.)** De Zosimo Ascalonita atque Marcellino. Pp. 93. Münster, 1926. Paper.
- Petch (J. A.)** The Old Oligarch, being the Constitution of the Athenians ascribed to Xenophon. Translated with an introduction. Pp. 29. Oxford: Blackwell. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Photiades (P. S.)** Ἀρκύον Δίκαιον. Διαφωτισθεὶς δημοτὸν δόκιμα ἐφ' ἧσαν ἐμπειρία καὶ διδασκαλία σχετικῶς Δημοσθ. χωρίων. Pp. 24. (Reprint from Ἀθήνα.) Athens: Sakellarios, 1926. Paper.
- Pocock (L. G.)** A Commentary on Cicero in Vatinius. With an historical introduction and appendices. Pp. viii+200. London: University of London Press, 1926. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Postgate (J. P.)** New Light upon Lucretius. Pp. 16. (From the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol. 10, No. 1, Jan., 1926.) Manchester: University Press, 1926. Paper, 1s. net.
- Prickard (A. O.)** The Return of the Theban Exiles, 379-8 B.C. The story as told by Plutarch and Xenophon, arranged by A. O. P. Pp. 96. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Reitsenstein (R.), Baehrens (W.), Pohlens (M.), Kahrstedt (U.)** Das Römische in Cicero und Horaz, Skizze der lateinischen Volkssprache, Staatsbürgerliche Erziehung im griechischen Unterricht, Die Kultur der Antoninenzeit. (Neue Wege zur Antike II, III.; pp. 66, 79.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner. Paper, 2.60 and 3 M.
- Reitsenstein (R.) and Schaefer (H. H.)** Studien zum antiken Synkretismus. Aus Iran und Griechenland. Pp. 355. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1926. Paper, 18 R.-M. (bound, 20 R.-M.).
- Ross (W. D.)** The Works of Aristotle. Translated into English under the editorship of W. D. R. Categoriae and De Interpretatione, by E. M. Edghill. Analytica Priora, by A. J. Jenkinson. Analytica Posteriora, by G. R. G. Mure. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Paper, 6s. net; cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Rostovtzeff (M.)** The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire. Pp. xxv+695; 60 plates. Oxford: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 45s. net.
- Sandstrom (O. R.)** A Study of the Ethical Principles and Practices of Homeric Warfare. Pp. 80. Philadelphia, Pa., 1924. Paper.
- Schiaparelli (L.)** Avviamento allo Studio delle Abbreviature Latine nel Medioevo. Pp. 99; 4 plates. Florence: Olschki. Paper.
- Schmid (W.)** Aristidis qui feruntur Libri Rhetorici II. Edidit G. S. Pp. xvi+146. (Rhetores Graeci, Vol. V.) (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubn.) Leipzig: Teubner, 1926. Cloth, G.-M. 6 (paper, G.-M. 5).
- Schuster (M.)** Altertum und deutsche Kultur. Pp. 656. Vienna and Leipzig: Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1926. Cloth, M. 12.50.
- Scott (W.)** Hermetica. Vol. III.: Notes on the Latin Asclepius and the Hermetic Excerpts of Stobaeus. Pp. 632. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Shields (E. L.)** Juno: A Study in Early Roman Religion. Pp. 74. (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 7.) Northampton (Massachusetts), 1926. Paper.
- Spiegelberg (W.)** Die Glaubwürdigkeit von Herodots Bericht über Aegypten im Lichte der ägyptischen Denkmäler. Pp. 44; 5 cuts, 2 plates. (Orient und Antike, 3.) Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1926. Paper, 3 M.
- Suess (W.)** De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis Cenae sermone vulgari. Pp. 88. (Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Dorpatensis B IX. 4.) Dorpat: C. Mattiesen, 1926. Paper.
- The American Journal of Philology.** Vol. XLVII. 2. Whole No. 186. April, May, June, 1926.
- The Antiquarian Quarterly.** No. 6. June, 1926.
- The Cambridge Ancient History.** Edited by J. B. Bury, etc. Vol. IV.: The Persian Empire and the West. Pp. xxiii+698. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 35s.
- The Journal of Roman Studies.** Vol. XV., Part 2. 1926.
- Thomson (W.)** The Rhythm of Greek Verse as exemplified in Aeschylus and Sophocles. Pp. 20. Glasgow: Jackson, Wylie and Co., 1926. Paper.
- Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association.** Vol. LVI. 1925.
- Van Buren (E. D.)** Greek Fictile Revetments in the Archaic Period. Pp. xx+208; 39 plates. London: Murray, 1926. Cloth, 24s. net.
- Van der Heyde (K.)** Composita en Verbaal Aspect bij Plautus. Pp. 122. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1926.
- Walzel (O.)** Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft. Lieferungen 55, 57, 61. Kappelmacher, Römische Literatur, Heft 1; Bethé, Griechische Dichtung, Hefte 7, 8. Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion 1926. Paper, 1 R.-M. each.
- Weinreich (O.)** Die Distichen des Catull. Pp. viii+110. Tübingen: Mohr, 1926. Paper, 5.40 M. (bound, 7 M.).
- Widstrand (H.)** Palladiusstudien. Akademische Abhandlung. Pp. ix+71. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1926. Paper.
- Wordsworth (J.) and White (H. J.)** Nouum Testamentum... Latine secundum Editionem S. Hieronymi. Part II., fasc. iii. Epistula ad Corinthios Secunda. Recensuit H. I. W. Pp. 279-353. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Boards, 10s. 6d. net.
- Wormald (R. D.)** Triennium. A three-year Latin course. Books I., II., III. Pp. 126, 160, 175. London: Arnold. Cloth, 3s. each.



Gr. et  
1926.

Kultur.  
Bilder-  
50.  
tes on  
ic Ex-  
ford :

Roman  
assical  
sachu-

von  
Lichte  
cuts,  
leidel-

riminal-  
n. 88.  
Dor-  
iesen,

Vol.  
May,

June,

ed by  
ersian  
Cam-  
359.  
XV.,

Verse  
ocles.  
Co.,

frican  
925.  
ments  
; 39  
Cloth,

rbaal  
dam :

ssen-  
appel-  
ethe,  
dam :  
aion

Pp.  
aper,

ische  
Alm-

uum  
onem  
stula  
. W.  
ress,

-year  
126,  
each.